THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. III OCTOBER, 1921 No. 16

EDITORIAL

The September number of the *Modern Churchman*, containing the papers read at the Girton Conference in August, has only come into our hands as we go to press; and it is not possible to discuss it in our present issue. But in the meantime we may indicate the point of view from which we shall endeavour to approach it. If the Press reports, particularly those in the provincial papers, gave at all a just account of what was said at the Conference, then we should have to recognize in our midst the existence of a tendency of thought so divergent from that of the New Testament and of Catholic doctrine in general that it is difficult to see how the two could long continue together. But the justice of these accounts has, in fact, been directly denied; and some of them certainly seemed inconsistent with what was known of the speakers' opinions from their other writings. We do not believe that "Modern Churchmen" desire, any more than modern Catholics, a recrudescence of the sterile controversies of the past; and our criticism of their utterances will be directed to the discovery, so far as possible, of a common basis of principle on which the rightful differences of theological opinion may be discussed. Meanwhile, we cannot refrain from expressing the hope that, if future Conferences are held, care will be taken to ensure that such reports as are allowed to reach the public are reasonably accurate.

RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY—CONSTITUENT GROUNDS

II.

In an earlier paper we distinguished the classes of experience which may be regarded as grounds of religious authority as four. These were: (1) Historical data, (2) the experience of the external world, (3) the moral conflict, and (4) religious experience in the restricted sense. It will be our object now to discuss these grounds separately and in more detail. Restrictions of space make it necessary that this discussion should be rather condensed.

The attitude of theologians towards the historical data of Christianity has undergone a curious change during the last century. At one time they were regarded as the principal support of authority in religion; now this support has been so undermined by a more scientific and critical attitude towards evidence that it is comparatively neglected for apologetic purposes. Both attitudes appear to err by being too one-sided. It must be admitted that no evidence for anything that is supposed to have happened in the distant past can be sufficient for an absolutely certain proof. But if we are content to balance probabilities and to establish a presumption one way or another, then facts of this kind may be of considerable value.

It can hardly be doubted that the religious tenets of individuals are, in fact, in a very large number of cases, founded in a considerable measure on the uncritical acceptance of historical evidence. The difficulties in the way of justifying such acceptance of historical evidence may be illustrated by a consideration of the question of miracles. It is clear that any attempt to prove a religion with certainty by the evidence for the reputed miracles of its founder must necessarily be futile. If we ask whether the miracles of Jesus Christ did, in fact, take place, we cannot be guided by the historical evidence alone, or even very largely. The weight of presuppositions provided by other types of experience will be in all cases so much larger than any specifically historical evidence, that any idea we may have that we are guided by this alone will be an illusion. The historical evidence is, in fact, judged by its conformity with the religious experience of the person making the judgment, and with his other experiences of the world. Its use as evidence must depend largely on this conformity.

The experience of actual eyewitnesses of the events of Christ's ministry, which forms the narratives of the Synoptic

Gospels, or at least of those earlier documents or traditions on which the Gospels were based, is of supreme importance for the purpose of this discussion. Here, however, we meet with the difficulty that the exact nature of this experience of the contemporaries of Our Lord is the subject of a controversy amongst historical critics which is not yet settled.

A certain number of things do emerge unquestionably from the Gospel narrative, and if we turn to early Christian thought the evidence is clearer. Jesus was regarded as God by St. Paul (as θεὸς not ὁ θεὸς). The Gospel of St. John is considered by some theologians to be full of symbolism referring to the Church and its sacraments. Whether or not this can be substantiated, it is clear that very early the Christian community became conscious of itself as a community, and that its sentiments began to centre round its system of rites. In this system, the Eucharist began to take a place which the study of comparative religions teaches us to recognize as that of the sacrifice. The death of Jesus from the time of St. Paul has a special significance for the problem of evil. It is regarded as an atonement for sin, and His bodily resurrection is insisted on as a guarantee of the ultimate triumph of good.

These are the data of historical Christianity, as obtained by an uncritically empirical method, which must be evaluated by their compatibility with other types of experience.

There is another kind of experience, closely related to the class of facts just considered, which is of importance as a possible ground of religious authority and as a possible challenge to it. This is the connection between traditional Christianity and non-Christian religions which is demonstrated by the science of comparative religion. While certainly disposing of any claim which Christians may have made that their religion is independent of all others, it does not necessarily follow, as Tylor and many more recent writers seem to suppose, that the mere enumeration of points in which Christianity is related to more primitive religions is sufficient to discredit it. It may, indeed, be argued that the similarity of any particular rite to the rites of more primitive religions shows the universality of the need to which it ministers, and that the similarity of dogmas shows the universality of the experience which they embody. That form of religious authority whose rites and dogmas show most relation to those of non-Christian religions may therefore claim that it is grounded most deeply on human experience.

Two of the traditional arguments for the existence of God, the cosmological and the teleological arguments, are essentially intellectual expressions of the constant tendency of the human mind to build up its religious beliefs in part by rationalizing

its experiences of the external world. In the theories of anthropologists, the savage is supposed to personify the force which moves a particular stone or river, and becomes a fetishist; while other primitive people explain the general experience of potency in objects by ascribing to them the possession of a vaguely conceived impersonal force—the Mana of the Melanesians. Similarly, in the cosmological argument, civilized man infers God as a necessity to account for the beginning of the chain of causal sequence; and, in the teleological argument, to account for design and adaptation to an end in the forms of organisms.

Whatever may be the intellectual soundness of these arguments, they are significant for the psychology of religion. They point to the fact that one of the mental roots of religious belief is in an elusive feeling that the world seems as if it had been made by someone, and by someone whose thoughts and feelings we can in some way share. This is the feeling about the world which is expressed in the vague poetry and prose of nature mysticism.

When this feeling is given intellectual form, we have the cosmological and teleological arguments. Their intellectual deficiencies have been plentifully shown by Kant and other philosophers. Kant considered that both arguments only managed to give an appearance of being metaphysical proofs of the existence of God by assuming the unsound and purely *a priori* ontological argument. In other words, they are not, as they claim to be, apodictic proofs resting on experience.

Ought we to dismiss them as mere fallacies, or have they some intelligible meaning for thought at the present day? Before trying to answer this question, we must notice that the attitude towards it suggested by the point of view of this paper is utterly different from that of the religious apologists of the last century. We no longer hope for an irrefragable proof of the existence of a benevolent God which must be conclusive to the most hardened sceptic unless he refuses to follow his reason. Our more modest search is for evidence which may establish a presumption (possibly a very strong presumption) one way or the other.

We may notice that Kant only denies the validity of the claim of the teleological argument to apodictic certainty. In the *Critique of Pure Reason* he recognizes that the emotional attitude towards the universe intellectualized in the teleological argument is, in fact, one of the roots of religious faith. He seems, moreover, to affirm the validity of the step taken by the mind from this experience to religious faith, if this be not considered as a self-sufficient apodictic proof, but merely as one of a number of empirical arguments. For he says that it

would be vain as well as sad to attempt to diminish the authority of the teleological argument, and considers that it may be accepted if it claims to be no more than a moderate and modest statement "of a faith which does not require unconditioned submission, yet is sufficient to give rest and comfort."*

He does not develop this idea, and his meaning is obscure. The interpretation of his thought here suggested, that he recognizes the value of the teleological argument as an empirical argument sufficient to help, in conjunction with other empirical arguments, to establish a certain presumption in favour of religious faith, seems to the present writer to be the best. He is aware that this interpretation would not be accepted by many philosophers.

There are other indications of the possibility of a revivification of the argument from design. The vitalistic interpretation of the evolutionary process finds the necessity for something more than chance variations acted on by a mechanical process of elimination to account for evolution. It is interesting to find that Bergson, in his *Évolution Créatrice*, when trying to speak of this evolutionary force, does so in language which can only be described as "theomorphic."

If facts of the kind which have so far been discussed were the only ones relevant to the formation of religious opinions, the emotional satisfactoriness of the hypothesis of a benevolent Creator would have been very strong. Christian apologists have too often been contented with a shallow and one-sided empirical method, which is content with a complacent enumeration of the more pleasing aspects of our experience, while ignoring facts of an opposite nature. A flood drowns ninety-nine persons, and the hundredth finds conclusive evidence of the existence of a loving God in the fact that he is saved. A truly empirical theology must take into account the experience of the ninety-nine drowned persons as well as that of the one saved in order to form a just estimate of the character of the Ruler of the World.

If some aspects of the world seem to be beautiful and harmonious, there are many others which do not. The disgusting, limbless parasite shows the same admirable adaptation to its environment as the nobler animals over which the enthusiasm of the eighteenth-century apologist was spent. The growth of self-consciousness, which has made possible the higher activities of man, has at the same time increased his power of suffering. Too often we see noble natures twisted or broken by the force of circumstances which seem utterly indifferent to human happiness and to human merit. Man's

* *Critique of Pure Reason*, 1st ed., p. 624.

own intelligence has made it possible for him to inflict cruelties on his fellow-men which cannot be paralleled in more lowly organized creatures.

Thus, the experience of the external world may provide the psychological antecedents of unbelief and rebellion, as well as of religious faith. The attitude of shuddering horror is a possible reaction to the drama of life. The attitude of a genuinely scientific enquirer into the empirical basis of authority in religion must be, at the beginning, neither that of an upholder nor of a denouncer of a particular theory. He must then ask whether the conception of a benevolent God, of a malevolent ruler of the universe, of a blind impersonal force, or of any other possible alternative gives the most satisfactory rationalization of the world as experienced.

It would be foolish in the limits of this paper to attempt an answer to this question, on which the world's thinkers have never been able to agree. The conception of a personal, malevolent ruler of the universe is one which has had so little following that we can afford to neglect it. The idea that the world is merely a chance collection of atoms on which a blind force is struggling to express itself in consciousness (the " immanent will " of Hardy) is one which, in one form or another, has found more favour. To such a belief the good, as well as the evil, in the world is the result of a blind chance.

Believers in this creed must, however, dismiss as illusory the appearance of purpose in the world which so much impressed Paley. A *prima facie* view of the world includes this element, which is rationalized by the conception of a personal God. It must be noticed, too, that this theory requires us to attribute such good as we do find in the world to the effects of blind chance. If we found that our experience of good drove us to a theory about it inconsistent with the idea that it is the product of chance (reasons will be discussed later for supposing that it does), then we should have a very serious objection to this theory of the universe.

If, however, the earlier hypothesis of a personal God has been accepted as the simplest rationalization of our experience of the external world accepted at its face value, we may go on to enquire what further content is given to this conception by the same kind of experience. A *prima facie* view of the world includes the experience of the antagonism between good and evil. A dualism of good and evil is, therefore, a primary element in a religion based on experience, although it may be necessary later to modify it.

This survey of the relation of religion to our experience of the external world seems to show that the purely empirical,

unreflective rationalization of this experience tends, on the whole, to result in the conception of a personal God with a sharply divided kingdom of evil opposed to Him. Both the idea of "personality" in God and this crude dualism may be modified by subsequent reflection and by the influence of other kinds of experience.

The next type of experience for discussion is what we have described as that of the moral conflict. This experience, expressed in its simplest terms, is that the individual "ought" to do certain things, some of which he does not want to do; and that he "ought" not to do certain other things, some of which he does want to do. If he fails to obey these commands and prohibitions, he has a sense of failure which he calls "sin." The consciousness of good and evil in possible lines of conduct is one of those experiences which demand rationalization by religious dogma. This rationalization is provided by the conception of a good God—that is, a God who approves of the attempt to follow the good in conduct, and who is sinned against when the evil is followed.

The moral conflict in the mental life of the individual plays a part in the formation of religious belief in two ways. First, there is the way indicated in the last paragraph. The moral conflict is found to be a part of experience, of which religion, as a mode of reacting to experience as a whole, must necessarily take account. Secondly, the religious motive may deliberately and consciously be put in the balance on the side of goodness against other interests which pull in the opposite direction. The love of God may be presented to the mind as an influence strong enough to counteract the power of sin.

These two modes of psychological reaction to the moral conflict suggest two possible extensions to attempts at the intellectual justification of religious faith on grounds derived from morality. The first mode leads to the arguments for the existence of God from the objective reality of the moral law; the second to a vague kind of ethical pragmatism in which the truth of religion is deduced from its moral value. Although the second of these lines of thought is, without doubt, a powerful influence in a great deal of popular religious thought, it has played no prominent part in the philosophy of religion.

The first is more important. It was employed by Kant in his *Critique of Practical Reason*. He argues that the *summum bonum* is the necessary true end of a will morally determined. This *summum bonum* is a true object, for the maxims of the will which, as regards their matter, refer to it have objective reality. Kant regarded the *summum bonum* as made up of two elements—morality, and happiness proportioned to that morality.

The first of these elements, morality, can be perfect only in eternity; so he is led (by the fact of the reality of the *summum bonum*) to the postulate of *immortality*. The same consideration leads Kant to affirm the possibility of the second element of the *summum bonum*—viz., happiness proportioned to that morality. This must lead to the supposition of a cause adequate to this effect; in other words, it must postulate the *existence of God*.

A different argument on similar lines is developed by Professor Sorley in his *Moral Values and the Idea of God*. He finds, as a constituent of reality, an objective moral order, as well as the order of nature. It is necessary to harmonize the order of nature with the moral order. To a *prima facie* view of the world they appear to be in conflict. "The order of nature intends a result which is not found at any particular stage in the process of existence. It requires an idea of the process as a whole, and of the moral order to which nature is being made subservient. It means, therefore, intelligence and the will to good, as well as the ultimate source of power. In this way the recognition of the moral order, and of its relation to nature and man, involves the acknowledgment of the Supreme Mind, or God, as the ground of all reality."*

Both of these lines of argument proceed, it will be noticed, from the objectivity of moral values. This objectivity, if there be such, is an empirical deduction. It means that our moral experience cannot be accounted for adequately by the assumption that moral judgments are simply judgments relative to the subject making them—*e.g.*, that they are merely statements about his own states of mind when he considers particular lines of conduct, as Westermarck argues.

It must be remembered, however, that moral experience is only a part of experience; so it cannot be expected that we should find sufficient proof of the existence of God in morality alone, or that the conception of God to which it leads us will be adequate to the whole of experience. It is interesting to notice that Kant looked upon prayer as an irrational mode of behaviour. If we regard belief in the personality of God as essentially a mode of behaviour towards Him, rather than as an intellectual opinion, as the mode of behaviour we might adopt towards another person and not towards an impersonal force, then it would be necessary to say that Kant did not believe in a personal God. His belief about God would not be adequate to ordinary religious experience.

The last constituent ground of religious authority which it is our purpose in the present paper to discuss is religious experience. By religious experience is meant the subjective

* *Moral Values and the Idea of God*, by Professor Sorley, p. 513.

emotional experience which tends to result in religious belief or behaviour, or which is the result of them. The moods of restless dissatisfaction which seem to find satisfaction in a felt permanence and unchangeableness which is God; the feeling of having come in contact with infinite goodness or the supreme object of love; the sense of sin and of forgiveness; are all examples of such emotional experience. It may come in answer to prayer, or after having taken part in religious rites, or it may be independent of any conscious act of the mind receiving it. In mystical states of consciousness these experiences become more insistent, and the sense of their " givenness " is intensified, often so much that they take the form of " visions " or " locutions." It must be noticed that, on the whole, the mystics themselves have tended to receive such abnormal manifestations with extreme caution, and to attach much less importance to them than did their wonder-loving followers.

It is possible to rest merely on feeling in religion without attempting an intellectual justification of it. This is the attitude which tends to result from anti-intellectual lines of thought; it is not a satisfactory one unless we are to abandon reason altogether, and allow ourselves to drift in a welter of vague intuitions without any power of deciding between the claims of rival systems of intuitions. If religious experience is to have any bearing at all on authority in religion, it is necessary first to examine the claim that psychological analysis entirely discredits it as a source of knowledge.

There can be little doubt that the authority of the individual's own religious experiences is the sense of " givenness " which accompanies them, the conviction that they originate outside him. For this reason he feels that he cannot argue about them. His answer to the sceptic is simply: " I have experienced, I know."

Yet this feeling of certainty cannot be used as an argument to convince others of the objective validity of his revelation, unless it can be shown that this experience of " givenness " cannot be caused in any other way than by the origin of the experience from an object outside the person experiencing. But, as a fact, this " givenness " is equally the mark of any experience which results from the irruption into consciousness of material from unconscious levels of the mind. The hallucinations of mental ill-health, the moods of terror which sometimes accompany mental disorders, have the same character of " givenness " as the visions of the saints and the waves of cosmic emotion of pantheist philosophers, and have the same authority over the person experiencing them. If we are to find a reason for supposing that the latter result from

a real insight into the highest reality, while the former do not, it must be for some other reason than because the persons experiencing them are sure of their reality, and cannot question their authority.

This does not, of course, give any reason for supposing that such experiences do not, in fact, originate from something outside the subject. It merely shows the weakness of a particularly simple line of defence for religious experience. Actually this line of defence has been used much less than seems to be supposed by the numerous writers who fancy that when they have demonstrated a possible psychological cause of the sense of certainty which accompanies religious experience, they have said all that is necessary about it. We do not find that the mystics justify the authority of their mystical states in such a crude manner. They recognize that their experiences may be illusions, and they rationalize illusory experiences by supposing that they come from the devil. The apparent extra-mental origin of their experiences is not, in itself, supposed to be sufficient guarantee of their authority. Their divine origin must be judged by their moral value, and by their conformity with the teachings of the Church. In other words, they must be judged in part by their conformity with the results of other types of experience.

There remains, therefore, the question of what lines of thought may be pursued in order to develop from religious experience empirical arguments for the truth of religious beliefs. It is possible here to give the barest outline of such lines of thought. A fuller discussion of this problem will be found in *Belief and Practice*, by Mr. Will Spens. The possibility of fitting the results of religious experience into a coherent system, and into a system which is not inconsistent with the theological system of traditional Christianity; the value of the religious solutions of mental conflicts as a means of conserving mental good health; the moral value of religious experience when dealt with in the traditional manner; and the coherence of the system built up from religious experience with the system which is derived from other types of experience, are all empirical arguments which are not open to the criticisms we have directed against the too easy argument from the subjective certainty of their authority felt by the person experiencing them. If we allow due weight to the limitations indicated in an earlier paper of any empirical argument drawn from the power of hypotheses to rationalize experience, then there seems to be no reason for not admitting religious experience as one amongst other supports of religious authority.

ROBERT H. THOULESS.

(To be continued.)

CHOIRS AND CHOIR SCHOOLS SINCE THE REFORMATION

II.—THE REVIVAL

The lot of the choristers during the eighteenth century was far from being an enviable one. The capitular bodies were not over particular about the rendering of the services; and the boys, being of little or no consequence in their eyes, were left very much to the tender mercies of the organist and choirmaster. The music copies were allowed to become corrupt, and careless copying was responsible for numerous mistakes. The century produced its great musicians, but they could make little headway against the prevailing apathy and neglect. Dr. Alcock, who had been a chorister at St. Paul's under Charles King, after visiting many cathedrals, complained that he had never come across music books "without numberless mistakes." The need for accurate copies was urgent, yet when William Boyce, after twelve years' labour, brought out his edition of Cathedral Music, he did little more than recover his out-of-pocket expenses. The principal subscribers were not the cathedral bodies, but private individuals. Only nine copies were purchased for use in St. Paul's Cathedral. The outlook for music lovers was certainly far from promising.

Far too little attention was paid to the education of choristers. In this respect the Church but reflected the spirit of the age, far too little interest being taken in any proposals for the improvement of national education. With this environment we cannot expect much from Choir Schools, which were generally in the hands of Deans and Chapters not renowned for their generosity. In the pre-Reformation period the services were in Latin, and all choristers had to receive some classical training. This necessity disappeared when the service books were translated, and although the schools continued the existing curriculum for a time, this was mainly due to the force of inherited custom. In the eighteenth century this tradition belonged to the remote past, and in many cathedrals the education was very little above the standard of the average National School, which in those days was of a very elementary character. The boys were selected because of their vocal powers, and the cathedrals and services, together with sundry and various concert parties, took up the greater part of their time. No schoolmaster wanted boys who were likely to upset his time-table, coming in at all hours, and leaving whenever it suited the Almoner's convenience to withdraw them. The

choristers at Westminster Abbey found a champion in Benjamin Cooke, the organist there during the latter part of the century. Cooke found that, according to the statutes of the college, the choristers possessed certain rights at the election of scholars, and pressed their claims until he secured for them the right of admission to the school. His successors were not equally keen, and the right fell into abeyance, possibly because, as Mr. John Sargeaunt suggests in his *Annals of Westminster School*, the boys were drawn from a class "for which a classical education was unsuitable." No doubt it was a difficult matter to arrange for the boys to attend at the usual school hours, and consequently Cooke's successors, wanting to have the boys entirely under their own control, were not very particular whether they went to school or not. Very likely the boys were not particularly anxious to avail themselves of their privileges, preferring outdoor life with its freedom to the routine and discipline of the classroom. It is said that the Westminster choristers spent their time between the services in St. Margaret's Churchyard, sailing toy boats in the puddles caused by the sinking of gravestones, or playing marbles on the flat slabs of altar tombs. This was the state of affairs right up to the fourth decade of the nineteenth century, when Dean Buckland opened a schoolroom, and appointed an Oxford friend as master. This was the origin of the present Westminster Choir School. It may surprise some people to learn that the Abbey choristers were at one time not unlike the naughty little boys at a suburban parish church.

At Durham, in 1819, the singing boys received a charity education, and wore a corresponding dress. They were, however, given precedence over the Grammar School boys when, in accordance with an ancient privilege, they attended the members of the Chapter after dinner, and read portions of Scripture to them. When this was over, a Canon Residentiary proceeded to address the boys in Latin!

Somewhat better treatment was meted out to the choristers at Exeter, where arrangements were made for the boys to have the benefit of a classical education, with the addition of writing and arithmetic. Parents were required to notify the Dean and Chapter if they wished their boys to attend these classes; but the advantages of a higher education were within the reach of all who cared to avail themselves of them. Throughout the eighteenth century there was at Exeter a choral celebration once a month, and on all Great Festivals. When the Bishop was present, the choristers preceded him as he left the church, kneeling to receive his blessing before he passed into his vestry. It was still the custom for them to do this in the days of Bishop

Phillpotts, the well-known Bishop of that diocese. Strange to say, this city, where at any rate the outward witness to Catholic practice was retained, was also the scene of disgraceful riots when certain clergy discarded the black gown in favour of the surplice.

"A very pretty bit of stir
Is getting up at Exeter
About this surplice fashion;
And many angry words and rude
Have been bestowed upon the feud,
And much unchristian passion.

"For me, I neither know nor care
Whether a parson ought to wear
A black dress or a white dress.
Plagued with a trouble of my own—
A wife who preaches in her gown,
And lectures in her nightdress!"

Ely was another cathedral where Catholic ceremonial was retained, incense being burnt at the High Altar on all Great Festivals right up to the end of the eighteenth century. The Chapter do not appear to have interested themselves very much in the choir. There were eight choristers, but they received no education except in music. In 1831 the organist was a certain Mr. Janes. In order to improve the service, he proposed to harmonize the Versicles and Responses, and started with the General Confession. He, however, got no farther, for the Minor Canons, who were unable to chant, combined and threatened him with dire penalties for presuming to lengthen the service!

At Wells the nave of the cathedral was used as a playground by the singing boys, who, among other forms of amusement, found pleasure in the pastime of throwing stones. James Turle was a chorister at Wells during the early years of the nineteenth century, and on one occasion he broke some glass in one of the windows, throwing a stone through St. Andrew's nose. Years after a verger, pointing to the damage, added, "That was done by the present organist of Westminster Abbey."

With the dawn of the nineteenth century came the temporary closing of the Choristers' School at St. Paul's. From being one of the premier schools in the kingdom, it had gradually declined. During the eighteenth century there were only eight boys who lived with the Almoner at his residence. Meantime the cost of living had risen considerably (present-day folk know well what that means), and when John Sale was appointed Almoner, he found the allowance for the maintenance of the boys insufficient to pay expenses. At that time he was receiving about £80 a year. The Dean and Chapter had let the cathedral estates at quite nominal rents, and there were no

available funds to spend on the boys. There was no alternative except to close the school, and divide what money there was among the boys. Thus St. Paul's came to have a non-resident choir. The Almoner managed to earn a precarious livelihood by hiring the boys out for public and private concerts, with the result that choristers were out all hours of the night, and their condition became a scandal to the Church. No school would receive them, and, except as regards singing, their education was entirely neglected. Rarely, if ever, were they called upon to repeat the Catechism.

The use of choristers for concert parties was, as has been already mentioned, fairly general. At Norwich, in the days of Zechariah Buck, who was organist there, 1819–1877, a clergyman in the diocese asked him to lend a boy to assist in the solos at a rendering of Mendelssohn's *Elijah*. The boy sent was A. R. Gaul, afterwards organist at Birmingham. The music was preceded by a dinner, and soon after the invited guests had taken their places a note was brought in and handed to the host; it was from Zechariah Buck, and read as follows: " Dear Sir,—Please don't let little Gaul have any pudding.—Yours faithfully, Z. Buck." One may be forgiven for indulging the hope that " little Gaul " had his pudding after all.

About this time Maria Hackett began to take an interest in the boys. She was born in 1783, and lived to a good old age, dying at 3, Manor Villas, Amhurst Road, in 1874. She was a regular attendant at St. Paul's Cathedral, and spent the whole of her long life in seeking to bring about some improvement in the condition of cathedral choristers. In 1810 she placed a fatherless boy in the choir at St. Paul's, and finding that he was not receiving a classical education, she made enquiries to ascertain the reason for this omission. Upon discovering that the original endowments had been diverted to other uses, she wrote numerous letters. The Bishop, Dean, and Canons all alike received communications from her, pointing out the urgency of reform, and reminding them of their duty. The Dean flatly refused to allow Miss Hackett to inspect the trust deeds in the muniment room at St. Paul's, rightly fearing that information gained from that source would be used as evidence against himself. The necessary evidence was, however, obtained from documents in the British Museum, and, armed with this, Miss Hackett met the persistent refusals of the Dean and Chapter with a threat of legal proceedings. A compromise was now effected, the Chancellor promising to appropriate a fair proportion of the revenues of his stall in order to make some provision for the classical education of the choristers. The Almoner's salary was increased to about £217, and William

Hawes appointed. In 1830 it was raised again, this time to £350, with the addition of some fines payable on the renewal of certain leases. This meant an allowance of about £50 a year for each boy. Upon his appointment in 1817 as Master of the Chapel Royal, Hawes removed to 7, Adelphi Terrace, Strand, which for nearly thirty years was the home of both sets of choristers.

Hawes, like many of his contemporaries, was renowned for his floggings. An old pupil, on being asked whether he remembered his boyhood days with Hawes, returned the significant answer: "Can I ever forget them?" Many of his pupils in after years distinguished themselves in the musical world, and among these were John Hopkins, the organist at Rochester Cathedral (1856–1900), Edward J. Hopkins, and Samuel Sebastian Wesley. The last named was described by Hawes as one of the best boys he ever had, and he was one of the two choristers selected to sing at the private chapel at Brighton whenever George IV. was in residence there. The King presented the boy with a gold watch on discovering that he was a nephew of his own private organist, Charles Wesley, in whose musical career both he and his father had taken a great interest. There is a story told about another of Hawes's pupils which has become well known by being (rightly or wrongly) associated with other schoolmasters. The boy was William Makepeace, who for fifty years was Master of the Choristers at Rochester. On one occasion the boy asked Hawes for a holiday, telling him that it was his birthday. Hawes, remembering that considerably less than a year had elapsed since the boy had come to him with a similar request, looked at him sternly and said: "If you have another birthday before a twelvemonth has passed, I'll thrash you within an inch of your life."

Hawes was a stern disciplinarian in school hours, but the boys did very much as they pleased in their spare time. The elder lads were often guilty of cruelty; practical jokes and merciless bullying were far too common. Cases were known of brutal ill-treatment, and sometimes small boys were put on the roof on a frosty night with no covering but their night-dress, and left there for hours. Perhaps it would have been as well had Hawes been a little more lenient in school hours, and a little stricter during the time supposed to be spent in rest and recreation.

Hawes's boys were in great demand at concerts and public dinners. Every Sunday and Thursday there were private concerts at the master's house, and it has been said that within three months of his appointment in 1812 the boys had fifty public engagements in addition to their regular duties. Capable boys were not allowed much rest. The two senior chapel boys

used to sing at the cathedral on Sunday as well as at the Chapel Royal. The services at St. Paul's were at 9.45 and 3.0; and at the Chapel Royal at 12 and 5.30. Royal choristers wore a scarlet and gold costume, and the two boys in the course of their four journeys between the cathedral and the Chapel Royal had to call at the house in Adelphi Terrace to don or put off this distinctive dress. They did not have much time to themselves until the last Evensong was finished.

The lot of the choristers had been improved, but Miss Hackett was far from satisfied. The behaviour in church left very much to be desired. The following extracts appear in the diary she kept in 1834:

"The choristers ran into church heated and breathless after the service had commenced."

"*Sat., Sept.* 6.—In the Creed and Lord's Prayer all parties seemed to be running races to try who should first reach the Amen."

"*Sun., Sept.* 7.—A numerous choir at the commencement of the service, but gradually diminished, till, at sermon, only the succentor and six boys."

"*Sun., Sept.* 21.—The whole choir withdrew before sermon, excepting one Minor Canon, one Vicar Choral, and five boys."

The Precentor at that time was the Rev. C. Almeric Belli. He was appointed in 1819, and died in 1886 at the advanced age of ninety-four. No doubt he did excellent work elsewhere, but he was seldom seen at St. Paul's. The witty Sydney Smith used to speak of him as the "Absenter." It is said that in 1852 he came to St. Paul's for some public function (supposed to be the funeral of the Duke of Wellington), but the officials, not recognizing him, refused to allow him to enter the cathedral. Still he was Precentor, even if his visits were few and far between, and at his death some mention had to be made of the gentleman in the cathedral report. His obituary notice read as follows: "Mr. Belli, in so accepting and holding office, was only acquiescing in an order of things which he found, and which probably had existed long before his time."

After Hawes's death in 1846 Bishop Blomfield appointed the Rev. Thomas Helmore, of plainsong fame, as the master of the Chapel Royal boys. He took them to his house in Robert Street, and St. Paul's boys were once again without a residence. They lived at their homes, and came to school every day. Hawes's successor was the Ven. W. Hale Hale, who held several appointments. He was Canon of St. Paul's, Archdeacon of London, Rector of Cripplegate, and Master of the Charterhouse. His total income was about £4,000 a year, with various other emoluments. To these duties were now added those of the

Almoner of St. Paul's, which, however, he only retained for two years. On one occasion an inmate of the Charterhouse appeared in chapel without having performed the necessary preliminary ablutions, and whose person betrayed the need of a liberal application of soap and water. Hale, taking the culprit to task, asked him: "Have you forgotten that vermin were sent as a plague upon the Egyptians?" "Ah, sir," replied the old man, "a worse plague than vermin was sent. Hail was sent."

In 1848 the Rev. J. H. Coward was appointed Almoner of St. Paul's. The boys continued to live at home, but the school curriculum was greatly improved, and included religious knowledge, Latin, reading, English composition, and arithmetic. A music master was added to the staff to give lessons in vocal and instrumental music. Under a benefaction dating from 1837 the gratuity to the boys on leaving was increased from £10 to £30. In 1853 a rule was framed forbidding the boys to sing anywhere except at the cathedral without the knowledge and permission of the Almoner. (This was the revival of an old statute which had been disregarded for centuries.) Thus, the pernicious custom of hiring out boys for concert parties came to an end. There was still a considerable amount of uphill work. The Dean and Chapter took little interest in the choir. In 1860 they accepted £100 bequeathed as a trust to provide an annual prize for the best Latin scholar. They took the money, but neither appointed examiners nor awarded the prize; and a satisfactory settlement was only arrived at after considerable trouble. Once again the indefatigable Miss Hackett was to the fore. Whenever the rights of choristers were in danger, her energy knew no bounds until they obtained just and fair treatment.

In 1871 the deanery of St. Paul's was offered to R. W. Church. At last the choir had a Dean who meant to take an interest in their welfare, and in whose eyes the reverent and devout rendering of the service was a matter of supreme moment. The Dean's estimate of his task can be found in his *Life and Letters*. It was far from being an easy one, for he had "to fight and reduce to order a refractory and difficult staff of singing men, strong in their charters and inherited abuses." With the boys he had to complete the good work which had been going on for over sixty years, and which owed, not only its inspiration, but its progress as well, to Miss Maria Hackett. In 1873 the choral foundation was reconstructed, and plans were drawn up for a Choristers' College to accommodate forty boys. This is the present building erected in Carter Lane at a cost of £20,000, the necessary money being obtained from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Dean Church laid the

foundation stone in January, 1874, and in 1875 the new building was ready. Thirty-four boys were admitted at once, and six more were added soon after, bringing the number up to forty. There the boys receive an excellent preparatory education, with the prospect of obtaining scholarships in Public Schools when they leave the choir.

Had Miss Hackett lived a few months longer, she would have seen the complete fulfilment of her cherished schemes. When she passed away in 1874, the choir at St. Paul's, at their own request and expense, attended her funeral at Highgate. It was the choristers' tribute of gratitude to one who had spent a long life in their service.

Miss Hackett did not confine her attention to St. Paul's. Every cathedral was visited and reported on. In the autumn of each year she took a six weeks' tour of cathedral cities "to look after her dear children." She never went empty-handed, always carrying some little presents for the boys in whom she took so great an interest. These periodical visits were continued throughout her whole life. When she was ninety years of age she visited St. David's, and three months before her death she was at Canterbury. In the early years of her life she wrote: "If life and leisure are afforded me, I trust these powerless members of the choir, so long as they require a friend, will find in me an ardent and disinterested advocate to the utmost of my abilities." Life and leisure were afforded her, and the wish expressed in that letter had abundant fulfilment throughout the course of the great revival of our English Choir Schools. Her name will be handed down to posterity as the "Choristers' Friend."

No survey of Choir Schools, however brief, would be complete without some reference to the work of another famous Churchman, who gave not only his time, but also his wealth, to beautify the services of the English Church. In 1843 Sir Frederick Ouseley went to Oxford, and just before completing his course temporarily filled the post of organist at Christ Church. In 1849 he was ordained deacon at St. Paul's, and licensed to the curacy of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge. While he was there St. Barnabas, Pimlico, was opened as a chapel-of-ease. The church was dedicated on the Feast of St. Barnabas, and from the start arrangements were made for daily choral services. Near the church were collegiate buildings, where the choristers were boarded and educated. The disgraceful riots which took place at this church are now a piece of familiar history, and need no more than passing mention. After the Rev. W. J. Bennett's resignation in March, 1851, Sir Frederick Ouseley gathered the boys together at Lovehill House, Langley Marsh, near Windsor.

There in a small private chapel the choral services were continued until some better provision could be made. Meantime Sir Frederick Ouseley purchased an estate at Tenbury, and in 1854 the foundation stone of St. Michael's Collegiate Church was laid. The church was completed and consecrated September 29, 1856, with collegiate buildings attached, and with every convenience for the maintenance and education of the choristers. Meantime, in 1855, Sir Frederick Ouseley was ordained priest and appointed Precentor of Hereford Cathedral, which post he held jointly with the benefice of St. Michael's. The buildings of his own foundation cost him somewhere about £40,000, and about £2,000 a year for maintenance and upkeep. His aim was to provide a model for the choral services throughout the country, and with this object in view he gave his wealth ungrudgingly for the good of the Church. The college provided a high-class preparatory education for the sons of gentlemen, and from Tenbury the boys were passed on to one or other of the great Public Schools. It was "the first school of the kind established since the Reformation." Its permanence was secured by an additional endowment of £20,000, a legacy from the Hon. Miss Georgina Rushout, a friend of the founder, and one who had always taken a deep personal interest in his schemes. If Miss Hackett was instrumental in arousing public opinion in favour of the choristers, it was Sir Frederick Ouseley who, by providing a model school, showed the kind of school which every cathedral ought to possess.

In 1880 a representative meeting of organists met in the Chapter House of St. Paul's, and passed a resolution recommending that no cathedral choir should contain less than twenty men and twelve boys, and that the boys should, in addition to board and lodging, receive a sound classical education. Public opinion had been aroused, thanks largely to the unwearying efforts of disinterested and enthusiastic pioneers, and when the century closed, a wonderful change had taken place in cathedral choirs. The Cathedral Commissioners appointed in 1879 sent a list of questions to all capitular bodies. Special enquiry was made as to the condition of the Choristers' School, and of any other school connected with the body; also how the income was divided between the Dean, Canons, Minor Canons, Vicars Choral, Choristers' School, and Cathedral School. Taken as a whole, the replies were satisfactory; still, in making their report in 1883, the Commissioners recommended additional grants to certain schools to improve further the education of the choristers, and in some cases there were demands for improvements on a new and larger scale.

At the present day, a visitor to one of our great cathedrals

would be shocked were he to find the service rendered in a careless and slovenly manner, so accustomed have we become to a beautiful and dignified choral service. It was not always so, and sometimes we are inclined to forget how great a transformation has taken place within the lifetime of the older members of the present generation.

In the symbolism of olden days, the worship of the choir was regarded as a type or picture of the worship of heaven itself, while the people in the nave represented the Church on earth. So priests taught their people in the Middle Ages. The devotion and love of Christian souls has in all ages found expression in the endeavour to make our choirs more worthy of that which in days gone by they were taken to represent. Christian people to-day owe a debt of gratitude to the composers, past and present, who have sought to make sacred music a fitting medium for the expression of the faith, hope, and love of the Church on earth.

W. Escott Bloss.

PROVINCES IN THE CHURCH

The Anglican communion is happily making progress towards a solid and uniform organization of its several parts; perhaps it will some day develop a central synod with more than advisory functions. The "List of Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference of 1920, arranged according to Provinces," falls under no fewer than nineteen heads, all of which represent coherent geographical regions, save the one in which are grouped the scattered sees in all parts of the world which own an individual allegiance to Canterbury. And we are told that there is the immediate prospect of the branches of our communion in China and Japan "obtaining full advantage of any rights attaching to provincial organizations." In those countries are dioceses which owe their origin to the United States and to Canada, as well as others which spring from English missions and are directly dependent on Canterbury. Furthermore, there is a "possibility" of the formation of new Provinces in Eastern and Western Africa. There is a steady encroachment upon the unorganized fringe, and an increasing hope that the whole communion will in due time attain to a complete canonical structure, though some outlying portions will find it difficult to place themselves. In what Province, for instance, can the two Bishops who supervise the scattered Anglican congregations of South America find a home? And perhaps the obstacles which hinder Newfoundland from entering the political life of Canada may be effectual to keep their Churchmen apart.

But these are minor matters. The important point is that, wherever conditions make it possible, Anglicans are grouping themselves together, after the immemorial pattern exemplified in the history of the Church, in Provinces. It is true that the political experience of our race has given a democratic tone to their organization which cannot be found in earlier times, and that the Encyclical Letter of Lambeth encourages this spirit. "We call upon each Church of our communion to develop its constitutional self-government, and to give more and better opportunities for service to all its members." But this, in narrower areas, is no new thing. The primitive town diocese, in the days before Constantine, was a self-governing body; and in our own country the later Middle Ages saw the origin of the vestry and of the churchwardens, for Parliament had taught that taxation and representation go together, and the introduction of Church rates had suggested that the payers should have a voice in the administration. From such humble beginnings, if we are to seek an historical origin, comes by extension the notion of the diocese as an administrative unit. But similarity of conditions, in fact, has produced a similar result without deliberate imitation. The modern diocese, whether worked altogether on voluntary lines or striving to create a system of contributions that shall supplement endowments, is the imitator of these early experiments. And the combination of dioceses for a more effectual achieving of these ends than is possible in isolation is their natural extension.

But it must be said that in many cases the inevitable tendency will be for the Church to lessen the importance of the diocese. There are already Provinces of the Church where the complaint is made that the central assembly distracts public interest from the local administration; and we may see the same process actually accomplished in the Assembly of the Scottish Presbyterians and in the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodists. Perhaps, if an Englishman may venture an opinion, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States has advanced further along this path than other branches of our communion. There the whole Church, as represented by its Assembly, has not only dwarfed the several dioceses, but has brought them into so close a union that there is no place for the Provinces that might have been expected in a territory so vast. It is true that in the State of Illinois a Province has been formed, but it seems to have no great importance, and not to have been imitated elsewhere. There can, indeed, be no such distinction as that between the Provinces of Canterbury and York in a region where historical events have never created a division, and where practical considerations forbid it. Americans from the newer States often

tell us that for them the United States are everything, their individual State little or nothing. For though the old Atlantic States have their own history and character, the political divisions of the larger part of that great country are purely modern, without natural frontiers or marked peculiarities, historical or social. Hence American Churchmen gravitate together. It would be impossible for them to find motives of sentiment or of business that could induce them to set up any intermediate organization between the single diocese and the whole Church; and it must be remembered that there are vast regions of the American territory where members of our communion are as rare as in Connaught, so that their struggling dioceses can only maintain themselves by the closest of partnerships with those in which our Church is more firmly rooted.

This weakness in America, where our Church, even at its strongest, is that of a comparatively small minority, is chiefly due to historical causes. The clergy, at the time of the Revolution, were mostly on the English side, and many were of English birth. They persisted bravely in praying for King George, and they have permanently involved their Church in their own unpopularity. We may take it, in any case, as an accomplished fact that in America the Church is a unit, and that Provinces, if ever they be created, can have but a nominal and derivative importance. Events are taking the same course in the great British dominions beyond the seas. Provinces, it is true, have been created, but the local Church as a whole is depriving them of their importance. For a brief space it seemed that in Canada and Australia autonomous Provinces were to prevail, and some people in England were shocked at the multiplication of Archbishops. Both were free from the historical difficulty of an inherited prejudice against our Church, though in Canada it has laboured under certain disadvantages which have reduced Churchmen to a smaller proportion of the total population than in England or Australia. Still, the Provinces created were in each case comparatively strong in numbers and in wealth, and might have developed into autonomous bodies had it not been for the superior attraction of the whole communion. But here, again, the Provinces are being crushed between the united Church and the single dioceses. No doubt for many important purposes they will retain their use; but it is inconceivable now, though once it seemed quite possible, that there should be a Book of Common Prayer peculiar to Ontario or to New South Wales. There is already such a book for Canada, and soon there may be another in use throughout Australia.

There is, then, a tendency for the Church to swallow the

Province; and also for the Province, however it may name itself, to be in fact a Church. There is no reason to expect, or to wish, that New Zealand should enter into closer relations with Australia in the ecclesiastical than in the political sphere. Its Church, thoroughly independent, may call itself a Province, but it will be more than a Province. It will be the counterpart of the Episcopal Church in Scotland or the Church of Ireland. Even if New Zealand created Provinces within its Church, they would count for as little—at any rate, in the eyes of the outside world—as do the venerable Provinces of Dublin and Armagh. They would be but parts of a whole which would subsist with undiminished force if they disappeared.

This brings us near to that picturesque anachronism, the Province of York. It is a thoughtless and erroneous commonplace to speak of the Church of England as "two Provinces of the Western Church." For more than eight hundred years York has been thoroughly subjugated to Canterbury, and the course of English Church history has been shaped by that fact. There were struggles, passionate and scandalous, but York had no success in maintaining its independence. The cause lay deep, in the consciousness of national unity, but the final victory was won by one of the most impudent and most successful of the many ecclesiastical forgeries of the Middle Ages. When William the Conqueror and Lanfranc, his best coadjutor, made up their minds to remodel the Church as well as the State of England, they were confronted by the awkward fact that a third person, the Archbishop of York, had a right to share their counsels. But promptitude and unanimity were impossible unless this intruder were excluded. And so, at the opportune moment, forged letters from bygone Popes were produced, purporting to withdraw from York its original equality with Canterbury. A recent fire had unfortunately destroyed the originals, but a copy had been taken just in time, and was triumphantly produced. The documents teemed with obvious anachronisms, but were accepted as genuine. Whether William was deceived we cannot tell; Lanfranc was certainly a party to the fraud, which was, after all, quite consistent with the standard of honour of his day. And it was successful. From that day York has never thought or acted for itself. It has been in practice an echo of Canterbury. As Thomas Fuller says, the Convocation of York has been like the hands of a clock whose works are at Canterbury. What was true in the time of Charles I. had been true for centuries before, and has been equally true ever since. And the alliance between the Sovereign and the southern Archbishop has at each critical moment been decisive for the fortunes of the English Church.

As William and Lanfranc schemed and worked together, so did Henry VIII. and Cranmer, Elizabeth and Parker, Charles I. and Laud. It is inconceivable that co-operation so harmonious could have existed had the Archbishop of York or his Convocation been allowed an equal share in counsel and in action. Perhaps the only case in which an Archbishop of York has taken the place of his rival as the chosen counsellor of the Crown has been that of Archbishop Sharp in the reign of Anne. Queen Anne's Bounty is the honourable memorial of their association. Wolsey was Archbishop of York only in name; his authority came from the combination of his Roman legateship with his position as chief minister to the Sovereign. We cannot regard York as in any way co-ordinate with Canterbury. The nature of things forbids its existence as a Province save for secondary and delegated purposes, which may, however, be important enough to justify the maintenance of one, and perhaps the creation of another, subordinate Province.

The Province, then, is a transitory phase at the best in the organization of a Church, and there may be Churches which do find it necessary to pass through this phase. This assertion, of course, only concerns Provinces regarded as autonomous. Within a Church sufficiently great to need administrative division the Province may well stand at the head of the graduated system of combination which widens out through the rural deanery, the archdeaconry, and the diocese. But obviously any scheme may dispense with one or more of these, and it is difficult to see that any elements are necessary save the individual diocese (which might conceivably have to act as an independent Church) and the individual cure of souls, whether or no we call it a parish.

But, in our actual state, there is a stage in which the Province, or its equivalent under another name, is urgently needed. We know how our missionary work is financed and carried out by those who are united in some closer feeling of association than that which joins all members of our communion, and we recognize the wisdom which has abstained from attempting to set up, under the authority of Convocation or otherwise, a central administration of our missions. Such a procedure could have no effect save that of lowering enthusiasm and diminishing subscriptions. But our missions are organized in dioceses, and the uniformity of teaching in some of these forbids the diocese to be, as it ought, a microcosm of the whole Church. A body, the collective wisdom of which may not exceed that of an English rural deanery, teaches its converts that what they have learned is the doctrine of the Church of England, while in fact it is but one of several representations of

the truth which are equally current among us and equally valid for us. The creation of a Province, in whose assemblies those who inculcate these several varieties of belief and of discipline must meet on equal terms and in the spirit of brotherhood, would be a salutary corrective to narrowness and a liberal education for the converts.

This may only be a transitory stage, destined to pass into a more perfect unity. On the other hand, it is conceivable that we may develop something analogous to the Uniate Churches in the Roman communion. These, as is generally known, have no connection with each other, except through the common centre. They are bidden to keep each other at arm's length; the clergy of one are not allowed to officiate in the church of another, nor the laity to communicate at altars which do not belong to their own rite. We can understand that historical and practical considerations may justify this elsewhere; we should regret its being necessary among ourselves.

Yet may there not be an opening for such a development in the reunion for which the last Lambeth Conference has prepared us? Peculiar jurisdictions were a common thing in the Middle Ages, and they survived in England till the Whig reconstruction of the Church under William IV. Not only great churches, as is the case still at Westminster and at Windsor, but a large number of parishes dependent on each, were extra-diocesan. Might not the same plan be adopted in regard to religious bodies with which we wish to be in communion, though we do not wish to direct their internal government? To take perhaps the simplest instance, might not the saintly little Church of the Moravians have in Fetter Lane its modest Westminster Abbey outside the diocese of London, and free from all such restrictions as our Act of Uniformity? Fetter Lane would then be the centre for all the scattered Moravian congregations throughout England, which would be "peculiars" with which the Bishops in whose dioceses they were situated would have nothing to do. The Moravians as a whole would be in relation with the Church of England as a whole, and not with the particular authorities which govern the districts in which they have an interest. The principle is capable, *mutatis mutandis*, of wide application. Why should there not be Provinces contemporaneously existing in the same regions of the Anglican communion, just as Uniate Churches co-exist without clashing in the Roman? The less they had to do with each other, within reasonable limits, the better it would be.

Is it possible to suggest a central government for such a group of autonomous Churches, or any bond of union save a common body of convictions, positive and negative, and a

general belief of each in the soundness of the others? It is probable that no such government would be accepted universally, and we may doubt whether it be desirable that it should be brought into being. But it is eminently desirable that each actual or possible branch of our communion should have so strong and wise a government as to enjoy the confidence of all the others, though, or because, it has marked peculiarities of its own. And here we may begin at home. We have a National Assembly; let us have a National Convocation. This would imply an even greater prominence for the Primate of all England than now is his. It may be only a point of antiquarianism, but in justification of such a claim there may be cited an Act of Henry VIII., never repealed, which empowers the Archbishop of Canterbury to bestow the *pallium* on the Archbishop of York. A thoroughly united Church of England would serve as a pattern and as a magnet of attraction to all the autonomous churches of our communion, whether or no they had passed through that stage of the Province which, it is here suggested, can only for ultimate purposes be regarded as provisional; though there is a deep interest both in the long history of our European Provinces and in the vivid, even if brief, life of those which have been established in the British Dominions beyond the seas.

E. W. Watson.

THE ORIGINS OF THE SEPTUAGINT AND OF OTHER OLD VERSIONS

A study for many years of the Septuagint, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and some other versions of Holy Scripture has led me to certain conclusions which I will state as clearly as I can, while striving after brevity. I do not claim my theory as altogether original. But I have not seen it definitely stated. I call attention, at starting, to several historical facts which have influenced my thoughts.

Firstly, Bishop Andrewes, in the seventeenth century, used to announce his text from the Vulgate, and then add *his own* English version. He did not use the Authorized Version (although he was, it is said, one of the translators).

Clergymen in France, and probably in other countries, act similarly now. They make their own translation from the Vulgate. In some cases they give a rendering of the Liturgical Gospel or Epistle at the Eucharist.

Secondly, I notice that this is what must happen in all mission-fields before a complete version has been produced and published. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge

and the various Bible Societies which have followed it later were not always in existence as handmaids to Christian missionaries. Even now a version in a language which hitherto has had no Bible *follows* the missionaries. It does not *precede* them. This is surely as true of the Christian missionaries in the first century as it is true of Livingstone or Patteson, of Duncan or Steere lately. It is true for all the Christian centuries. It is true of the old Gothic or Slavonic versions.

A missionary to a tribe which has been previously untouched by Christianity firstly acquires some knowledge of his hearers' language. Sometimes there are bi-lingual natives, such as his "porters" and "guides," to help him. Then he translates a text, a parable, various portions of Holy Scripture, as he needs them to tell the Master's message.

Thirdly, in such a case, no two missionaries would always make *identical* versions. Nowadays it is soon decided that a printed edition of the Gospels, the Psalms, the Epistles, the whole Bible must be produced. There is money and organization for this in the old Christian lands. Suitable missionaries meet and combine, and correct their fragmentary versions. The result is shown to, and discussed by, others working among those who use the same language.

Finally, there is a version, fairly accurate, ready to send home for printing. Of course, in the early stages men kept notes of their renderings, partly for their own use to save time, labour, and trouble, and partly (nowadays) with a view to the later complete version. But even this has (usually) to be revised from time to time, when the native Church has grown, and missionaries and native Christians understand better each other's languages and modes of thought.

Fragmentary translations precede complete versions, and early complete versions are revised after a time. Bible versions are *not* produced as men translate a popular French or German book for a publisher.

Now, what happened in Alexandria ? We may accept the usual story that the Septuagint arose there. A Jewish colony settled in Egypt in the time of Jeremiah, about 587 B.C. They no doubt had Hebrew MSS. of *part* of the O.T. They could not have the later minor prophets, nor Ezekiel, nor the later Psalms.

If the modern critics are right, they could not have had P., nor the present Pentateuch. Anyhow, we have no evidence of this colony being at a later date in touch with the Greek language, or its having any relation with the LXX, though *possibly* the different order of Jeremiah's works in the two recensions (M.T. and LXX) may be due to this migration.

We must confess our ignorance. We do not even know whether this colony fused with the later ones.

A larger Jewish colony was settled in Egypt about 320 B.C. under Alexander the Great, and another joined it 312 B.C. Sooner or later the younger members of these settlements and their descendants became Greek-speaking, just as non-British immigrants to U.S.A. and Canada become English speakers. But they had synagogues and teachers, and therefore retained their religion. Circumcision would help this. For convenience' sake I will call these teachers or elders by the (perhaps) inaccurate name of *Rabbis*.

We know that in Aramaic-speaking congregations or synagogues the Rabbi read the Law in Hebrew, and then gave an oral Targum or interpretation. He did pretty much what Christian preachers have done with the Vulgate, what they probably did at first with the LXX, and what English missionaries for a time have done with the English Bible before vernacular Bibles existed. So the Targumin were formed, compiled out of preceding individual interpretations and sermons. Some would be more paraphrastic and homiletical, while others would be nearly literal,

So in Egypt Rabbis probably read the Law in Hebrew for a time, and then gave as good an oral Greek version as they could (compare the well-known phrase of Papias). Naturally, they would keep notes; naturally, also, their pupils, the future ministers, removed by time from a Hebrew-speaking generation, would take notes. The notes would be fragmentary. It should be remembered that even in Palestine Aramaic was superseding Hebrew. The LXX has been called "a Greek Targum."

How far these fragments were combined into a complete "Law" before the date of the Septuagint's formation we cannot tell. But some fifty years later (or even later still, according to which of the Ptolemys we connect with the LXX), a Ptolemy or his literary advisers wished to have a copy of the Jewish Law among the other literary treasures of the National Library. Our librarians will appreciate this desire. Perhaps statesmanship as well as scholarship led to this plan. So far we may accept the story of Aristeas without its later legendary embellishments (see Schürer, English translation, Div. II., vol. iii., p. 161). The Jewish leaders are summoned. Perhaps they did appeal to Jerusalem. They, or their delegates, make a complete version of the Law out of previous oral or written fragments which had been used in their synagogue worship and other religious teaching of their own young people and of proselytes. But these fragments had not been all alike. Rabbi Moses would render in Gen. i. 14, εἰς φαῦσιν, Rabbi

Isaac had always said εἰς φωτισμὸν, while Rabbi David would prefer ὥστε φαίνειν. We remember how Christian missionaries in China differed as to the best word to use for the Divine name. We remember how Bishop Andrewes on Christmas Day, 1617, six years after the issue of the A.V., which was partly his own work, announced his text from St. Luke, " Ye shall find the Child swaddled, and laid in a cratch; and straightway there was with the angel a multitude of heavenly soldiers " (Sermon XII. *on the Nativity*).

Still, the LXX (or the LXXII) produced a complete version of the Jewish Law—*i.e.*, the Pentateuch. And the old variant renderings soon began to creep into the copies of this version used by the Jews themselves. We should value very highly indeed the original compilation which was delivered to the royal authorities. But Amron, the general of the Caliph Omar in A.D. 651, destroyed the Great Library, which had already suffered in the siege by Julius Cæsar. So the " official " copy is lost for ever. It would have been free from later corruptions. It would not have given all the renderings current at the time, and perhaps not all the " readings " of Hebrew MSS.

It was a great saving of labour for the synagogue teachers to have a complete version at all. No doubt many of the variants which we now find are due to later copyists. But mere blunders are easily discovered, even if they cannot easily be rectified. Things like the spelling of proper names do not matter much. But some variants are old ones, as we see from Philo. And we also see how in the first century, probably before Theodotion lived, St. John's Gospel and the Revelation could contain non-Septuagintal passages which seem to come from his version. He probably used old renderings which are not found in the official LXX, or are only found as variants.

Later books of the O.T. were no doubt translated by individuals, not by a company. We find several different styles and vocabularies. No uniform translation would have a score of Greek words for one Hebrew word, nor, *vice versa*, a single Greek word representing many Hebrew words. And the individuals who translated single books or groups of books doubtless used older fragmentary synagogue materials, proceeding from Rabbis with different styles, vocabularies, and degrees of knowledge of both languages. The wonder is that we do not find even more traces of this than we do. But, possibly, just as the Massoretic recension conquered other Hebrew texts by the simple process of destruction, so a settled LXX text was no doubt aimed at even in pre-Christian times (and by a less drastic method), and the traces of other real early renderings may be merely survivals.

I turn to the Latin versions, and for the sake of brevity will only deal with the N.T. A complete *Greek* N.T. did not come into existence immediately after its last element was written. Probably there was a long interval. This consideration seems to affect the value of the great Greek Uncial MSS. Conceivably, B *might* have good ancestors in the Gospels and bad ones in the Epistles. Some critics hold that this is the case, though they differ as to which is bad or good, according to their views on "Western" elements in the text. Similarly, B in the O.T. is not good all through. This remark applies to all the Uncial MSS., or, rather, to all complete Greek Bibles and New Testaments so far as they or their immediate predecessors were copied from MSS. which only contained single books or groups of books.

When we turn to the O.L. it is clear that the translators had not a complete N.T. codex with which to deal. No *one* person, or even *one* company of persons, took a complete Greek N.T. and produced a complete Latin one. Probably few Churches had all the books which form our present canon.

The statements of men like Eusebius, the lists formulated by councils, are all later than the early Latin version (or versions). If there were doubts, if there was ignorance in some places at the later dates as to the extent of the canon, there was more room for ignorance at the earlier time. And when St. Jerome revised the Latin N.T. he fortunately left sufficient traces of the early state of things. His inconsistencies help us to see the truth. The surviving witnesses for the O.L. also support this view. But we need only look at the Vulgate.

κοινωνία=communicatio, 2 Cor. xiii. 13; societatem, 1 John i. 3.
πονηρόν=malum, Matt. vi. 13; malignum, 1 John ii. 13.
παρακαλεῖν=rogare, Matt. xiv. 36, etc.; deprecari, Mark i. 40, etc.
ἐπιτιμᾶν=increpare, Matt. xix. 13; comminari, Mark x. 13.
ἀρχιερεύς=princeps sacerdotum, Matt., *passim*.
ἀρχιερεύς=summus sacerdos, Mark, *passim*.
ἀρχιερεύς=pontifex, John, *passim*.
κεράμιον=laguena, Mark xiv. 13; amphora, Luke xxii. 10.

There are many other cases. St. Jerome did not succeed, any more than the A.V. or even the R.V. did, in securing "uniformity of rendering." The lack of uniformity is due to the earlier versions being of single books, or even of portions of books. And at the back of this lies the competing vocabularies of individuals.

When an individual Christian turned a book of the Greek N.T. into Latin, did he start *de novo* as a translator of a modern

French or German book would do? Probably not. As with the LXX translators, he would use oral and other material. And possibly there was (unconscious) competition. Several translators at different times and in different places would compile versions. Surely the O.L. of St. James's Epistle has two forms. (See Dr. Sanday, *Studia Biblica*, 239, "How many original versions do they imply? I answer, though as yet tentatively, two.")*

What more natural than that, when Christians increased in number and congregations became richer and more acquainted with each other, the translations of individual books should be formed into groups (Gospels, Pauline Epistles, Acts, Catholic Epistles, etc.), and then into complete codices? And when this was done a comparison would be made between two versions of any one book, and a judgment formed by Church leaders, and a selection made, which became the *versio usitata* or (old) Vulgate. St. Augustine gives his opinion on this very point. So with our English versions. R.V. is based on A.V. (though with constant reference to the originals, and in the N.T. with less regard to previous work). And A.V. was based on Coverdale and Tyndale. Behind these lay Wycliffe and Purvey. Is it not probable that behind these lay the many *oral* versions of many preachers from the Vulgate?

One misconception is frequently repeated. It is said that the LXX was the first instance of a book being translated from one language to another. Buhl (§ 37) says "one of the oldest." In view of the bilingual and trilingual inscriptions of Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, etc., and also remembering the translated Accadian literature in the library of the Babylonian Sargon (about 1800 B.C.), it is clear that this statement needs modification.

What are our conclusions?

1. Oral versions of portions of Scripture precede written ones.

2. Written versions of portions precede those of whole books.

3. The formation of complete Bibles in any language followed the publication of portions or of single books.

4. When complete Bibles were formed, or even collections of groups of books, revision and attempts to get a perfect text necessarily followed.

5. Written versions of single books or of portions of books were the work of individuals, but the larger collections were

* I agree with Bentley in rejecting *Itala* in the well-known passage of St. Augustine, but I doubt his emendation; *illa*, with *quæ* for *nam usitata* (the *us* of *interpretationibus* being confused with the following *us*), seems more probable, especially if *interpretationibus* was contracted in some MSS.

to some extent official—that is, promoted by, or subsequently recognized by, leaders in the Jewish or Christian Churches.

6. The necessary variations of rendering due to the work of individuals seldom disappears entirely in later, official, complete versions.

7. Jewish teachers in Egypt originated the LXX. Catechists or missionaries were the progenitors of the O.L., and thus indirectly of the Vulgate.

8. Perhaps our Greek N.T. variants in the Gospels—*e.g.*, the Western text—are not only due to copyists or scribes, but sometimes go back to the various (oral) renderings from the Aramaic by early catechists of the portions they were expounding (see Matt. xi. 15, 19, 23).

GEORGE FARMER.

THE CHURCH'S MESSAGE AND MINISTRY TO THE SICK*

THERE is no department of pastoral work in which the Parish Priest of to-day is more sincerely seeking instruction than in his ministrations to the sick. Taught, as his father was, by Dr. Gott, "he takes care to go from God to his people: distinctly sent, possessed, energized, enabled by his Lord; he has something more than sympathy, ten times more than warning or advice, to give them." He recognizes that the Office for the Visitation of the Sick in the Prayer-Book is at the best insufficient and shares the desire expressed by the Lambeth Conference of 1908 for "more helpful and less ambiguous petitions for the restoration of health—always subject to the Will of God—than this Office at present supplies." His tongue often cleaves to the roof of his mouth if he tries to say, "Whatsoever your sickness is, know you certainly that it is God's visitation," for he remembers our Blessed Lord's "groaning in the spirit." His "rebuke" of the fever, His explanation of the infirmity of one "whom Satan hath bound." Dr. Gott and other lecturers in Pastoral Theology in the last century recognized that there is a "vital and complicated" association between the physicians of body and soul—"vital, for he must keep our joint patient alive, else our ministry ceases, and he must restore the sick man, else our art is barren; complicated, for the average client has two diseases, one spiritual and the other bodily, and it is

* (*a*) *Divine Healing*, by Dr. H. Pakenham-Walsh (Bishop in Assam). S.P.C.K. (price 2*s.* 6*d.* and 1*s.* 3*d.*); (*b*) *The Healing of the Sick.* Offices for use in the Church of England compiled by the Guild of St. Raphael. Mowbray (price 2*s.* 6*d.* and 1*s.*).

generally difficult to cure one without risking the other." This appears to the Parish Priest of to-day to ignore so much that he has learnt of the interaction of spirit and body one on the other. Has he no message to rouse the sufferer to fight against disease as he would have him fight against sin? No message of hope to assure him that the physicians of soul and body alike are on the side of God, who hates disease and sent His Son to destroy it as the fruit of seed which an enemy hath sown in His good field while men slept? Has he not some more definite share in the Ministry of Healing than to stand by while the other physician works? If he has, what is that message? What is that share? And how is he to exercise it?

These small publications will be welcomed and studied with special sympathy and interest because they give an answer to such questions. We link them together because Dr. Walsh's interpretation of "The Will of God in Relation to Healing" in Chapter III. and the instruction by "G.P.T." on "The Grace of Healing in the Catholic Church" in the Guild's Office-Book resemble one another so closely as to convince us that the Church's message can be clear and definite. Both Dr. Walsh and "G.P.T." have had long experience in the ministry they commend to us, and the message they would have us deliver is identical with the message of the Lambeth Conference Committee of 1920, appointed to consider and report on the Christian Faith in relation to (*a*) Spiritualism, (*b*) Christian Science, and (*c*) Theosophy. In the words of the Committee's Report (p. 125), "While disease is a part of the lack of harmony with the perfect will of God, and thus all healing powers are an expression of God's will and power to heal, yet pain and suffering in themselves also bear witness to the working of God's laws in nature in this present order."

In Dr. Walsh's words, "Revelation, history, life alike constantly teach us that we must distinguish between the Will of God in itself and the Will of God as conditioned by the limitations which He Himself has allowed to be laid on it." "While, then, I hold that healing is the will of God, and that in individual cases this is frequently, and indeed with few exceptions, His will for those who turn to Him with the prayer of faith, I also hold that there are cases where servants of God, even though strong in faith, are called upon to continue bearing sickness and pain." "My practice is to teach the patient to concentrate his desire upon the *Glory of God in Christ*—on that, rather than on bodily relief. I endeavour to build up his faith in Christ's power to heal and in God's general will as regards healing, and then I ask him to offer his body as a living sacrifice to God, that God may be glorified in it and in the sickness, whether by an

act of healing or by such greater blessing as will most manifest the Glory of God."

"G. P. T." writes: "The sick person should be warned that the desire to find a miraculous kind of healing where other means have failed is not on the right lines; but he should be so instructed as to make the desire that our Lord should be glorified in him the real object which he has in mind." "There are those who gather from our Lord's acts in Galilee that it is always, without qualification, His will to heal now wherever there is disease, even where there is little or no sign of the genuine faith in the Christ which He seems to demand of those who would come to Him for healing. Is it not rather true to say that the whole store of grace for healing of soul and mind and body exists in Him; but that they who would experience the flowing of this grace must be led by the Spirit of God to be taking part with our Lord in His struggle against sin and disease? Are we to pin our faith on a sudden and immediate recovery, such as is sometimes granted to prayer? or are we generally to expect the spectacle of a fresh power within tending to the conquest of the disease? It seems as if we should always be prepared to hail with joy and to expect the more vivid presentation of the answer, but at the same time to know that what we generally find is the entering of new conquering elements tending to master the disease." This is a very different message from the message of Christian Science. It is a call to a living faith in a living Christ, to an active trust in a conquering Power, to the rousing of our wills to co-operate with a Perfect Will revealing itself to those who walk in the Spirit.

That this was in its early days the message of the Church is made clear to us by the compilation of prayers from early liturgies recommended by Dr. Walsh as "of extreme beauty and full of teaching"—*Prayers for Healing* (Allenson): many of which are also to be found in *The People's Missal* (Mowbray).

But the Parish Priest has not only a message to deliver, but a ministry to exercise. He will find in these treatises much practical instruction. The ministry is the ministry of the Church, distinct from, but co-operating wholeheartedly with, the ministries of science, whether physical or mental. Dr. Walsh says: "There are three types or planes of healing, the one connected especially with physical science, and operating predominantly in the sphere of the body; the second connected with psychology, and operating predominantly in the sphere of the mind; the third connected with religion, and operating predominantly in the sphere of the spirit. . . . In speaking of divine healing in this paper, I am confining my attention to this third, while whole-heartedly admitting that there is a sense in

which the other two are divine also." The words are evidently chosen with care: we should have preferred that he should have spoken of three "avenues for healing" and of the healing being ministered "through" the body, mind, and spirit; for this, it seems to us, expresses better the ultimate aim of making the entire man whole. And in this ministry through the spirit the whole Church may exercise itself: Bishops, priests, laity, have their respective shares.

Dr. Walsh was a member of that Committee of last year's Lambeth Conference from whose report we have quoted. He tells us in effect that he was one of a large minority of the whole Conference in favour of a resolution urging the recognition of this ministry. He writes of his experiences because he is assured that they will be valuable to Bishops, priests, and others ministering to the sick, especially in Provinces and Dioceses which will probably be soon taking action with regard to such recognition and to the regulation of the ministry.

The Bishop's Share.—In his consecration, one of the works the Bishop is specially enjoined to do is to "heal the sick." Not long ago one wrote within a week of his consecration: "How do those who lead the healing movement in our midst interpret these words? Is there any reason to believe that the grace of episcopacy has power of healing? Is this singling out of the work of healing in the Consecration of a Bishop ancient or peculiar to our Ordinal? How did it come in, and in what sense was it understood?" Some of us who have tried to study the matter replied that as the gift of healing was committed to the whole body of the Church in the persons of the Twelve as part of the original Commission, and, as the Episcopate is the channel of the historic continuity of the Church, it is to be supposed that the gift of healing does reside in the Episcopate. The charge is connected now, as in the Second Prayer-Book, with the delivery of the Bible; but in the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. with the delivery of the Pastoral Staff. Its origin may perhaps be traced back through the Sarum *Celebratio Ordinum* to the *Consecratio* in the Gelasian Sacramentary, "*Da ei, Domine, ministerium reconciliationis, in verbis et in factis, in virtute signorum et prodigiorum*"; which seems to show a distinct expectation of "miraculous" powers and of the manifestation of gifts of healing. The charge may, of course, be interpreted as purely symbolical with "bind up the broken"; but we recall our Blessed Lord's use, as recorded in S. Luke iv. 18, of Isaiah's words in lxi. 1 (*e.g.*, "the recovering of sight to the blind"); we are sure also that in His Commission to the Twelve (S. Matt. x. 1-8) He was not speaking metaphorically. It would be unnatural too to limit the interpretation to the Bishop's

act in the blessing of the oil, especially when we remember that its use in the Western Church was practically reduced, since the Council of Florence in 1439, to Extreme Unction with no intention of healing the body. We would see, therefore, in the Consecration Charge at least this—a responsibility resting in the Bishops as the chief ministers in the Church to provide for the reverent and faithful exercise of healing gifts; and after a long period of comparative disuse of the gifts and disregard of the responsibility we look to the Bishops for example and instruction in reviving the practice of the ministry. We have some encouragement in the Lambeth Resolutions, and we expect more when the Committee for which the Conference calls is able to report.

The Priest's Share.—Dr. Walsh does not write primarily as a Bishop. His experience in the ministry began in 1912, nearly three years before his consecration. Before exercising it "permission was sought and gladly granted by his Bishop"; and he does not contemplate that any priest would venture on healing ministrations without his Bishop's approval or that priests would "ask for episcopal sanction for this ministry unless they have seriously and prayerfully considered it." "Where it is asked for I think it should be freely granted, except in cases where the Bishop has good cause to doubt the spiritual or mental fitness of the priest to fulfil this ministry." Is then the ministry of healing "inherent" in the Priesthood? There is no charge to the priest at his ordination corresponding to "heal the sick"; but he is bidden to "be a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His holy Sacraments," and he receives authority to "minister the holy Sacraments in the Congregation" *where he shall be lawfully appointed thereunto.* These last words, and of course the foregoing promises, carry a sense of regulation by episcopal authority. Dr. Walsh (p. 52) considers that "a ministry of healing inheres in our Commission"; but the word "our" is ambiguous, and he quotes words addressed to the Twelve. He appears to interpret this "inherency" as applying to the ministry of Holy Unction, though he is careful to avoid calling it a sacrament. "The priest should teach publicly and privately about anointing and should, if permitted by his Bishop, be ready to minister the rite." His experience leads him to point out that there may be physical and mental grounds on which the priest "should refuse anointing" when it is asked for: "it is not the anointing that heals, and I would not give the impression that there is any magical virtue in the consecrated oil." In cases where the will of the patient cannot co-operate with "the healer," he advocates prayer and the laying on of hands; "the latter is not merely a

sign, it also speaks through the sense of touch to the sick person and, where the charismatic gift is present, actually conveys healing power." In short, Dr. Walsh would have the priest, as a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, deliver the message of God's will and power to heal; it will follow that the sick will send for him and expect him to exercise the healing ministry of which S. James speaks: to do this fully he needs charismatic power (δύναμις) as well as ministerial authority (ἐξουσία); the authority he possesses inherently as a priest, the power may or may not be in him—may be occasionally granted to him (p. 21); he has authority (regulated by his Bishop) to anoint or to decline to anoint: the power is given by the Spirit Who "divideth to every man severally as He will." Not the least valuable pages of Dr. Walsh's book are those of Chapter IV., in which he helps the priest to prepare himself and the patient for the ministry.

The Share of the Laity.—"The moment there is anything wrong in the human body the *vis medicatrix naturæ* sets to work to put it right," and S. Paul's analogy may be applied surely to the physical as well as the spiritual ills that spoil the Body of Christ. When the Will of God in relation to healing is faithfully and convincingly preached, the "prayer of faith" for the sick will be real, definite, and prevailing: prayer circles will be formed and perhaps linked "with one or other of the existing guilds—the Guild of S. Raphael (27*c*, Bramham Gardens), which emphasizes the sacramental aspect, the Guild of Health (3, Bedford Square), which emphasizes mental healing on lines of faith and prayer, the Emmanuel League of Prayer (140, Sutherland Avenue), which is interdenominational." But what Dr. Walsh says of ἐξουσία and δύναμις leads us to expect some definite reference to a lay ministry, and we find it on p. 9, and in Chapter VII., p. 51 ff. The δύναμις, the charisma, may be granted by the Spirit to lay men or women. "This power is sometimes spoken of as 'animal magnetism,' sometimes as 'psychic power.'" "When dedicated to God it becomes a gift of the Spirit, though there is reason for thinking that it can exist in a person whether or no it be so dedicated." We could criticize Dr. Walsh's wording here. He speaks more correctly and more clearly on p. 50, of cults and healers of all sorts, and of "those who are sane, spiritual, unselfish, and loyal to the Church, and who possess a genuine gift of healing, but whose gift is remaining unused because there is no authority in the Church to direct them in the exercise of it." These were presumably in the mind of the Lambeth Committee when they recommended "Authorization: All who are licensed under due authority for this work should be persons who are loyal to

the Church's faith and sacraments, who are willing to work in full co-operation with the medical profession and the parochial clergy." Dr. Walsh urges that such should be encouraged, tested, and observed, and commended by their Parish Priests to their Bishop as deserving his licence. The Church must be very careful how far it may rightly and wisely "pledge its credit": but it must be equally careful to use its gifts. The faithful communicant, who has gifts of healing, would be differentiated from "misguided and unbalanced healers who may heal the body, but lead the mind astray," and from "those who make use of their healing power, real or pretended, as a means of gain," by some form of episcopal licence—to be periodically renewed—commending him as a loyal Churchman with recognized gifts and discreet and humble in the use of them. The Church should provide training for these persons, whether men or women, in theology and the devotional life, in psychology and physiology, and in the practice of their ministry.

Both the books we are reviewing provide offices for use in the Anointing of the Sick; both supply instruction in details which will be valuable to priests to whom the ministry is unfamiliar: Dr. Walsh mentions the names and publishers of larger treatises, which should be read by those who desire further knowledge of the theory and history of the ministry.

We could wish that Dr. Walsh dwelt more on the thought of the Risen and Ascended Christ living, moving, working in His Church. This lack is abundantly supplied in "G.P.T.'s" Instruction.

R. P. Roseveare.

MISCELLANEA

Oremus.

For Clerical Students and Others.

(*A Prayer of S. Thomas Aquinas.*)

Creator ineffabilis, qui verus fons luminis et sapientiæ diceris, da nobis intelligendi acumen, retinendi capacitatem: ingressum instruas, progressum dirigas, egressum compleas: per.

PAPERS FOR THE PRIESTHOOD

A.—DEVOTION

By Rev. W. B. Trevelyan, formerly Warden of Liddon House

IV.—MEDITATION

In her Life of Bishop Moorhouse (of Melbourne and Manchester), Miss Edith Richards gives an interesting account of a remarkable spiritual experience about which, until he reached old age, the Bishop is said seldom or never to have spoken. "Shortly before his ordination he became despondent. He was intensely anxious to come into some real communion with God, but prayer seemed fruitless. In his despair he cried aloud to his Heavenly Father for love and nothing more. The time was night, and in a moment his soul was so flooded by a mighty inrush of divine love and joy that it almost burst the bounds of personal restraint. This divine rapture lasted for days, and then the vision faded into the light of common day."* This experience seems to have been the turning-point of his life. As a reviewer of the book says, "He, like St. Paul, had seen a vision—the risen and ascended Jesus had shown him something which made all attempts at description ridiculous."

It may well be that there are amongst us to-day many others who have such visions to tell, if only they could be told. But it is, and always has been, characteristic of such experiences that they cannot be told. There exists no language in which they can be expressed, and it is probable that to tell them would be to rob them of all value.

It is a real difficulty for any matter-of-fact person to write of these things at all. He can only (so it seems to the present writer) speak of them as he might of a distant country which he has never seen; and there is all the difference in the world between such a report and that of the man who himself has travelled in the land he attempts to describe. "Not as if I had it in myself in feeling and in working, as I have in talking," says Walter Hilton, the old English mystic, in his *Scale of Perfection*. "Nevertheless," he goes on to say, "I would, by this writing of mine (such as it is), first stir up my own negligence to do better than I have done."

* From Review in *Church Quarterly*, April, 1921.

To leave out, even in a few brief papers such as these, the whole of the deeper side of prayer must be, if prayer is in any sense intercourse with God, practically impossible. Who knows whether deep and inexpressible experiences may not be given to any of us? A priest, too, remembers that at any time he is liable to have to guide others in such paths. Though we are taught by those who know most of the mystical life that such experiences are possible for all, the fact still remains that there never will be many who are ready to face the discipline which alone can fit them for such a privilege, or who are ready to go through the mental suffering usually called "the dark night of the soul," which seems to be an inevitable part of the preparation. How few of us have the courage to face with any hopefulness even the more ordinary and by no means exceptional difficulties of dryness and darkness in our prayers.

But, without making any presumptuous attempts to speak of that to which probably few of us can hope to attain, it cannot be wrong to consider, at least briefly, such subjects as Meditation, Contemplation, and the Prayer of Silence—some of the steps which, in all ages, have led the saints on to these great experiences.

"Meditation," says Baron von Hügel, "is the ordinary foundation of the interior life, and the ordinary prayer of beginners, whose imperfect love requires to be thus excited and sustained by distinct and reflective acts. Contemplation is called by the mystical saints "a simple and loving look," as discriminating it from meditation and the latter's many methodic and discursive acts, and as limiting it to a simple and loving consideration and view of God and of divine things, certified and rendered present to the soul by faith. It is the ordinary prayer of perfect souls, or at least of those that have already made much progress in the divine love. For the more purely a soul loves God, the less it requires to be sustained by distinct, reflective acts; reasoning becomes a fatigue, and an embarrassment to it in its prayer—it longs but to love and to contemplate the object of its love." Baron von Hügel goes on further to show that without contemplation the soul may arrive at a very high perfection, and that the most discursive meditation may contain the beginnings of contemplation.

There can be few of us who have not again and again been baffled by the difficulties of meditation, both in our own experience and also in our attempts to help others to understand and to practise it.

Before then even attempting to go farther, something must be said of meditation, without trying to give any formal or detailed guidance which would not only be presumptuous, but probably needless in view of the many books, great and small, which have been written on this subject. It should also be remembered that this is a matter in which it is dangerous to press particular methods. *Tot homines tot meditationes* one might dare to say. Many who ask advice in the matter are discouraged by being expected to conform to a particular method.

The essence of meditation is the *brooding over* certain words or thoughts with a view to assimilating their teaching and storing their lessons in our hearts. A passage, a verse, or even a word of the Bible usually provides the material needed. To the Gospels we naturally turn first. Clearly, too, we can do nothing without the aid of God the Holy Ghost; so, after placing ourselves in God's presence and making a few brief acts—*e.g.*, of Faith, Hope, Love, and Contrition—we shall say the *Veni Creator* or some similar prayer. Then we shall give what time we can to a quiet pondering over the words. To have at least read them through over-

night, so as to have them in our mind before we sleep and on waking, is of great value.

The danger for most people in meditation is lest it should be too exclusively a matter of the head rather than of the heart; this must be guarded against by remembering that our aim is intercourse with God, rather than the acquiring of fresh knowledge. We shall talk to God over what is suggested to us, again making acts, and using the will in making resolutions of a practical and definite kind, such as can be carried out at once. It is, of course, unnecessary to confine ourselves to the Bible for subjects; and, for a time at least, we may well, with a view to gaining facility in the practice, use some of the many books of meditation which have been published, taking care to remember that in doing so we are perhaps specially liable to make the mistake of using the heart and will less than the head.

Most of us know only too well the difficulty of all this, and the peril of abandoning the effort through discouragement. It is important, therefore, to remember that we can only judge to a very small extent the value of our own meditations. The very waiting upon God brings its blessing, even if He seems to say very little to us.

Short of giving up meditation, we may and sometimes ought to vary our method, or change our book. It is often well to substitute for a time the reading of some spiritual book, choosing (one may say parenthetically) one which has stood the test of many years of use in preference to a more recent one. It is a mistake to think we must always kneel. We shall be wise to begin upon our knees, but sitting is often a more profitable posture.

A few words must be said as to the duty of a priest to his people in this matter, for he has not only to think out his own problems, but almost daily to help others in their difficulties in the matter of prayer. Few of us can look back with any satisfaction on our efforts to do so, and many of us must wonder whether we have not, with the best intention, laid upon those who have consulted us burdens heavier than they can bear.

It is to be considered whether it is wise to use the word " meditation " at all; it not unfrequently alarms simple people, suggesting, as it does, something more intellectual than they are equal to. It might be well if, for instance, we spoke of it as " mental prayer." When St. Benedict uses the word *meditatio*, and fixes a daily definite period for it, he is recommending a quite different exercise from that " discursive meditation" which we usually describe by the word. The Abbot Primate of Downside (*Benedictine Monachism*, pp. 61 *ff.*) says that the prayer inculcated by St. Bernard " was not a reflecting on a religious truth or a thinking out of some point, but was a meditative, prayerful reading of Holy Scripture or some pious book. The mental prayer inculcated by St. Benedict was rather what is called " affective prayer " or " prayer of simple regard," the soul being lovingly intent on God."

To such prayer as this it is obvious that we are bound to try to bring our people, according to their individual possibilities, only guarding them against the danger of mere dreamy and unpractical waste of time.

B.—IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

IV.—AN INTERLEAVED BIBLE

The purpose of our notes this month is to recommend the practice of taking notes in an interleaved Bible. The importance of learning how to take notes can hardly be exaggerated. No one can remember more than a very small amount of what he reads, and the main purpose of study is to teach him where to find the required information upon his special subject. It is not desirable to burden the brain with the task of remembering masses of information. Unfortunately, methods of note-taking are so individual that one scholar cannot well pass them on to another. Each must find out for himself what is most suitable in view of his special needs.

There is one method, however, specially suitable to a theologian, since his life's work is to understand the Scriptures—namely, to provide himself with an interleaved copy of this, his textbook.

Perhaps a record of personal experience in this connection may be pardoned. I began taking notes in an interleaved Hebrew Bible and Greek Testament during college days. The Hebrew Bible is still in use; the Greek Testament lasted seven years, and was then discarded. The causes of the failure are instructive. To begin with, the edition used, Westcott and Hort's, was too small. The notes which accumulated opposite a page of the Sermon on the Mount, or a difficult chapter of the Epistles, soon exceeded the space available. Then I began to find that interesting notes could not be used again, because there was nothing to show whether they were my own ideas or were copied. So I made a new start. I bought Tischendorf's large edition, and had it interleaved in four very strong volumes. No expenditure has ever been better justified. The volumes are worth more to me than all the rest of my books. Even now I am not satisfied. Had I to make a start now I should plan the notes on different lines. In the light of my defective books I suggest the following methods to anyone who wishes to experiment along these lines:

The first requisite is a well-printed text. Print which is easily read at thirty tires the eyes at sixty, and a book which is to be a lifelong possession must suit old age as well as youth. The New Testament (I leave out the Old for the present) must be strongly bound, in several volumes. It will then stand constant usage, and extra pages, maps, and sketches can be inserted as required. Tischendorf has an elaborate critical apparatus, and the space opposite this is available for notes. If a text with a small page is chosen, it should be bound up with paper of a larger size than itself, so as to give the requisite space.

Having got your book, rule the blank pages thus: Reserve two-thirds of the page for notes on the separate verses, leaving one-third for general remarks on the whole passage. Draw horizontal lines across the page, and number them with the verse numbers. This will naturally be done by instalments as need arises. Next, draw a vertical line down the middle of the page. Use the left side for critical and exegetical notes, the right side for homiletical and devotional, such as are likely to help in sermons. There is a real advantage in keeping critical and devotional

notes in the same book. Thus, opposite Rev. xiii. 18 may be written on the left a note on the critical theories about the Number of the Beast, and on the right room might be found for an ingenious remark that the real name of the Beast is "Number One." Critical notes will be mainly copied from others. Be careful to quote exactly, using inverted commas conscientiously; when you give the general sense of the author only omit them, but add his name in brackets. Always give the page of the book, unless it be a commentary, when the author's name is all that is necessary. To avoid repeating a title frequently, write it in full once for all at the top of the page when it first begins to be useful, and content yourself afterwards with a summary title. Save space by every kind of device, employing arithmetical symbols as well as literary abbreviations. Make out a list of these symbols, lest after a long illness or travel you return to your books and find you have lost the key to your own notes.

After these elaborate preparations keep the books always on your desk, and count each day lost in which you have not added to the treasures stored in them.

C.—PASTORAL WORK

By Rev. J. J. G. Stockley

IV.—DEALING WITH INDIVIDUALS: HEARING CONFESSIONS

The "Ministry of Reconciliaton" is, thank God, becoming more and more recognized as part of the normal and ordinary work of Priests in the Church of England. A very large number of clergy who have not as yet heard Confessions profess themselves willing to do so if called on; and an even larger number of laity who have not as yet made their Confessions are most willing to admit that this way of penitence may, for others, be the right way, and may even for themselves be, in the end, that which will bring lasting Divine peace to their souls.

If there is anything which we can affirm to be permanently true of human beings it is this, that everywhere men and women crave for unity in their own lives. They show, in all sorts of ways, how ardently they desire the "Kingdom within" to be at peace. Unless they are among those who "sin boldly," and deliberately after a time choose evil to be their good, they seek by every possible means to get rid of the struggles and inconsistencies that disturb and ruin their lives. They will determine to ignore how unsatisfactory they themselves are, and will attempt to forget it all by throwing their energies into philanthropic work (of a sort), or by drugging their souls with sensational amusements carried to the extreme, or by yielding themselves to passion. But it is God Who is speaking to such people; it is His Voice that asks them the question, "Where art thou?" and the attempt "to hide" within "the trees of the garden" is as useless now as it was at the first.

That there is an extraordinary and ever-increasing unrest of soul—among educated people especially—is proved by the fact of the popularity of psycho-analysis. Men and women will go to a psycho-analyst and lay bare the inner secrets of their lives in the hope of attaining peace and strength. I do not blame them in the least. If the very tradition of Catholic Christianity had not passed away from their minds, they would

know that the Church can, in the Sacrament of Penance, give them exactly what the psycho-analyst professes to give them, and far, far more. Only before they can attain the desired harmony of all the parts of their own nature they must be at peace with God. And that they may be at peace with Him they must know that the words Responsibility, Sin, Atonement, Repentance, Forgiveness, represent deep and firm realities of Divine Revelation and human experience.

For although there is unrest of soul everywhere, there is not at present any sign of a real revival of vital religion on a large scale. There cannot be any such revival, the late Mr. Gladstone affirmed, unless there come first a renewed and quickened sense of the seriousness of sin. This is what we are really suffering from. Modern men, as a great scientist lately wrote, are not "worrying about their sins," and, *therefore,* they are not overweighted with a sense of moral responsibility; and from this all evils flow in every department of human life.

As Priests of the Church of the Saviour of mankind we are, then, confronted with these two facts: (1) the almost universal unrest and disquietude about themselves among serious people, outside and within organized religion; and (2) the almost universal weakening of the belief in the seriousness of sin.

Amidst such circumstances we are called on to exercise the Ministry of Reconciliation entrusted to us at our Ordination. When we strive to take the Christian view of God's justice and mercy, when we realize the value in God's sight of each soul He has created, and when we know the awful effects of sin in destroying and desolating humanity, then, indeed, we are astonished by the very meagre and unsatisfactory method by which the Anglican Church, as a whole, attempts to deal with sinners.

Theoretically all is right. To *every* Priest is given the Commission: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained."

Every Priest is ordered to say daily the words: "He hath given power and commandment to His Ministers, to declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the Absolution and Remission of their sins."

Every Priest, when he celebrates the Eucharist, gives the general word of Absolution: "Pardon and deliver you from all your sins."

Every Priest is bidden to move the sick person to Confession, and is then ordered to absolve him in the words, clear and definite beyond discussion: "I absolve thee from all thy sins."

Every Priest is bound to invite his people, if they cannot quiet conscience otherwise, but require further comfort and counsel, to open their grief and "receive the benefit of Absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of . . . conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

But, *practically*, how different things are! Even now, although I suppose that the majority of clergy recognize that the power of Absolution is given to them, how few, comparatively speaking, exercise this ministry persistently, and as a normal part of their duties, and make it easy for their people to receive God's word of forgiveness in the way so plainly authorized by Christ, and so universally accepted by the Church.

God forbid that we should attempt at this time to put the blame on any individuals. Indeed, the extraordinary history of the Church of England

during the last three and a half centuries sufficiently accounts for our present laxity and inconsistencies.

Only let us at last realize the urgent and wide and deep demand there now is that we clergy should carry out in practice what we profess to believe. In sincere humility and penitence, and with earnest reliance on the Holy Ghost, we have to fit ourselves to be wise, patient, and Christ-like Confessors. It is surely evident that before we can co-operate with the Great Physician of souls in healing the spiritual ills and diseases of His people we must know what those ills and diseases are. How can we know unless the sufferers tell us? And they will not tell us unless we first make everything simple and homely and easy for them. For we must, once and for all, take away from English people's minds the suspicion and dread of Confession.

That the atmosphere of suspicion still surrounds the whole question is fairly obvious. There are, I am convinced, thousands of well-meaning people who feel the need of Confession, wish to make their Confession, have no distrust, personally, of their own Parish Priest, and who, nevertheless, do not make their Confession, and are therefore never, all their lives, quite sure whether they are at peace with God. They really crave for the word of Absolution, but they will not go the way to receive it.

Why is this? It is because the mists of old-fashioned prejudices and suspicion have never been altogether got rid of. They have listened to absurd accounts of what Confession is—such, for instance, as the common view that it is a sort of minor inquisition of the penitent on the part of a Priest. Or they do not grasp the full meaning of "the seal," and therefore imagine that a Priest will think worse of them because of what they confess, and will, perhaps, show it by his manner. Or their minds may have been poisoned by worse and more shameful calumnies.

Whatever the reason is why these "people of goodwill" are not able to have the full and glowing consciousness of God's forgiveness granted in Sacramental Absolution, the facts remain, and it is our duty as Pastors of souls to proclaim that "to the godly there ariseth up light in the darkness"; and to teach, patiently, wisely, and lovingly, the complete Gospel of Christ's Sacrifice, man's Repentance, and God's Forgiveness.

How, then, can we fit ourselves for this great work? (1) First of all, and in a most special sense, the true Confessor must have learned something of the inner spirit of Christ the Good Shepherd. We do not represent ourselves but Him. We must have made our own His severe and awful view of the sinfulness of sin; and never for a moment adopt the popular view that sin only matters when its ill effects can easily be manifest in life. We must fully understand what is meant by "the deceitfulness of sin," and its ruinous results in the gradual destruction of human souls. And, on the other hand, we must have *something* of Christ's invincible love and persevering care for human beings. When we are Ministers of the Sacrament of Penance, we do not represent God's Justice but His Mercy—infinite in understanding, and full of hope for the sinner. Anything like hardness or impatience is most blameworthy and hurtful. For we would all acknowledge that we are essentially doing Christ's work, when through our Ministry the Power of His Passion flows in forgiveness to the souls for whom He died. Every moment, then, should the Priest remind himself that it is the Lord Jesus Christ Himself Who—through us His unworthy Ministers—is welcoming, healing, forgiving, restoring, the lost one.

(2) We must train ourselves in knowledge of how to deal with people. Human nature is very intricate and unaccountable, and it is terribly easy to make serious mistakes in giving advice and direction. We should read all we can, and especially psychology and casuistry. The following books will be found most useful:

William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience.*
Starbuck, *The Psychology of Religion.*
Watkin Williams, *The Moral Theology of the Sacrament of Penance.*
Father Belton, *Manual for Confessors.*
Schieler-Heuser, *The Theory and Practice of the Confessional.*

(3) Such practical matters as the days and hours when we hear Confessions must be duly considered, and we must be careful to suit the circumstances and convenience of our penitents.

Above all, we should ever keep in mind the end and object of the Ministry of Reconciliation—namely, the restoration to grace, and then the building up of the Christlike character. One of the common objections to the Sacrament of Penance is that its effects are weakening, and that the soul becomes enervated by learning to rely on the advice and direction of a human being, instead of on the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Such effects may actually occur in cases where unduly frequent Confession is pressed on all as a duty—quite apart from personal characteristics. We must guard against this with all the wisdom we are capable of. For we do not want to make anyone to rely on *us*. Our aim is the very opposite—to help weak and sinful human beings "to cast off the works of darkness" and "to put on the armour of light"; to "be stablished, strengthened, and settled" by the Power of the Spirit, in Jesus Christ, and to the Glory of the Eternal Father.

D.—CIVIC RELATIONS OF THE MINISTRY

By Miss A. Deane, O.B.E.

III.—LOCAL EDUCATION PROBLEMS.

Local Government, especially in Relation to Education

For the purpose of Local Government the entire area of England and Wales is divided into administrative Counties and County Boroughs. When a town has over 50,000 inhabitants it becomes a county borough, and is quite independent for all Local Government purposes of the Counties which surround it.

Every County has a County Council, a body established by the Local Government Act of 1888, and it is an elected body and may consist of men and women. The County is divided into constituencies, some of which are boroughs and some are known as County Divisions. These facts are important in connection with the position of Education in relation to Local Government. The powers of a County Council are very wide. They were originally empowered by the Local Government Board with authority, by provisional order, over all local matters belonging to any State Department. The Council works through committees, and these have to deal with Finance, Education, Small Holdings and Allotments, Public Health and Housing, etc. The Education Committee must include co-opted persons (men and women) who have experience in educational matters.

It is important to remember that the County Council controls such questions as the defining of boundaries, dividing districts and parishes into wards; it authorizes the election of Parish Councils or the grouping of two or three parishes under one Parish Council; it deals with any complaints a Parish Council may make with regard to the district authority; and it authorizes the borrowing of money.

A County Council may make Bye-Laws, but these have to be approved by the Home Secretary. It is often very difficult to get Councils to draw up Bye-Laws—for instance, in connection with questions affecting the employment of children, street trading, selling newspapers, etc.—and it is not at all an uncommon thing to find that bye-laws are laid upon the shelf and not very often reviewed or brought up to date.

The County Council is the authority for all Elementary Education within its area, excepting in the case of boroughs with over 10,000 inhabitants, when the Town Council or the Urban District Council, whichever it may be, becomes the Education Authority. The County Council is the authority in any case for "Higher Education," and it is responsible for raising the Higher Education rate; it may establish continuation schools; it may help by offering scholarships, by providing training for teachers for technical education and rural education. It is responsible for Reformatory and Industrial Schools, and exercises its powers in matters such as medical inspection and feeding of school children.

All are now familiar with the main features of the new Education Act, and will agree that it represents a huge advance on any previous educational measure. By it the development of a national system of education, spoken of in the King's Speech in December, 1913, has become a fact, and primary education is linked with secondary and secondary with the University, and what Lord Haldane called the "University Idea" is recognized.

Under the title "Elementary Schools" we have the ordinary elementary schools, the higher elementary schools, a small number of schools known as "certified efficient," and Schools for Blind, Deaf, Mentally Defectives, Physically Defectives, and Epileptics. The Voluntary Schools also come under this heading, and belong to the Church of England, the Roman Catholics, Wesleyans, Jewish, and Undenominational.

Secondary and Technical Schools include schools controlled by Local Authorities, Endowed Schools, Welsh Intermediate Schools, schools under the Girls' Public Day School Trust, schools under Roman Catholic orders, and Private Schools.

The whole of Elementary education and of Science and Art instruction in schools and institutions in receipt of public money is controlled by the Board of Education. It prepares the code of regulations for Elementary Schools, inspects them, and allots the Parliamentary Grants; it lays down regulations as to number, qualifications of teachers, examines, certifies, and registers them, and inspects the Training Colleges which are aided by grants; it decides as to the necessity for new schools. If an Authority fails to fulfil any of its duties, the Board may proceed against it. The Board of Education must also be consulted by the Local Authority about any scheme for the promotion of Higher Education.

There has been a steady growth of technical and continuation schools, and an increasing evidence of willingness on the part of employers to allow apprentices and others in their employ to attend day continuation schools. Agricultural education has been gradually developed, and farm

schools and farm institutes have increased in number. Many counties are doing splendid work with travelling farm schools, teaching milking and butter and cheese-making in different parts of the country. The work of agricultural education is undertaken as a rule by a special Sub-Committee of the Education Committee in conjunction with representatives who are experts of the County Agricultural Committee.

The question of "exemption" and the school-leaving age is one of those subjects about which there is always discussion and difficulty. All educational reformers are unanimous in agreeing that the school-leaving age should be raised. In the past the appeal of early "exemption" has been successful on the ground that the children are required to become wage-earners at the earliest possible moment, owing to family circumstances and poverty in the home. If the standard adult wage is good, and a man has something more than a bare living, this necessity should be done away with. The abolition of sweated industries and the establishment of a minimum rate below which a worker shall not be required to work should in the future enable the parents to forgo the earnings of children, giving them a better chance in life from the educational standpoint. The Law protects the child-worker to-day, but there is ample evidence that many local Education Authorities have in the past adopted a very easy-going policy with regard to the granting of Exemption Certificates. The Board of Education is helping with grants a number of Continuation Classes, which are run in connection with clubs and Adult Schools and Settlements, very often undertaken by the Workers' Educational Association. This Association is doing magnificent educational work to-day amongst working men and women. Tutorial Classes in connection with the Universities have proved successful, and shorter courses of lectures are arranged, undertaken by University men and women who are able to give their services in this way. There is ample evidence of the real desire on the part of hundreds of working men and women for continued education. The writer was responsible a few winters ago for a course on Economics for working men, and the zeal and enthusiasm shown by the students was most inspiring.

Many clubs for women and girls have been infinitely more appreciated by the members when it has been recognized that they are anxious to learn something, and that a connected course of study under the W.E.A. is possible.

Shorter hours of work and longer hours of leisure may prove disastrous if the leisure is not rightly used. Education can save the situation, and it is within the power of those who have themselves learnt how to make life beautiful with the nobler sources of joy to share them with those who as yet have them not. If you have knowledge and the power of imparting it, offer your services to the W.E.A. and help to make the local branch flourish.

A NOTE ON PSYCHO-ANALYSIS AND CONFESSION

It was perhaps inevitable, when once the main principles of the New Psychology became well known, that certain superficial parallels between the procedure of the psycho-analyst in the consulting-room, and that of the Priest in the confessional, should be greatly exaggerated.

The similarity between the unearthing of a " repressed complex," and the confession of a sin which has been gnawing at the vitals of a man's spiritual life, seems at first sight so extraordinarily obvious. Nevertheless, that many clerical writers, both Roman and Anglican, have misunderstood some of the essential features of psycho-analysis, and laid themselves open to the charge of assuming knowledge which they do not in fact possess, is clear from references to this alleged " parallel " by more than one recent writer on psycho-therapy. It seems highly important that the clergy should realize that the divergences between psycho-analysis and Confession are at once more numerous and more significant than the apparent affinities. These differences may be briefly summarized as follows:

(1) The complex with which a psycho-analyst is dealing is seated in that part of the patient's mind known as the Unconscious: in technical language, it is " repressed." (With the possible causes of this repression we are not concerned here.) That is to say, it is unknown to the patient's ordinary waking consciousness, and *can only be discovered* by the elaborate technique for which the word " psycho-analysis " should properly be reserved, consisting of a (sometimes lengthy) series of " word-association " tests, analysis, and interpretation of his dreams, etc. Now, in hearing Confessions, a Priest is *never* dealing with a repressed complex in this technical sense of the word " repression "; for, clearly, a sin that is repressed cannot be confessed. I can no more confess my " repressed " sins than I can confess the sins of a man of whose existence I never heard. The sins I confess may be the result—perhaps are the result—of a repressed complex. But I cannot confess the complex, since I am not conscious of it, and can only gain consciousness of it by the methods of psycho-analysis. (Of course, some other method may yet be discovered; but up to date this is the only one known.)

(2) In the vast majority of cases, *one* " analysis " either cures or—doesn't! The psycho-analyst has no sort of sympathy with the Catholic system of repeated, much less frequent, Confessions. He insists that this frustrates the soul's autonomy, the only worthy goal of psycho-therapist or parson.

(3) But at any rate, someone may say, there is a real parallel between the " direction " of a wise Confessor, and the psycho-analyst's primary aim of " sublimation " ? Both are surely engaged in the same work here—that, namely, of redirecting into healthy and useful channels impulses and desires (*libido*) which have been running in the wrong ones ? The present writer must confess that in a recent article* he fell into a mistake on this point: but he has been corrected in a letter from Mr. A. G. Tansley† (which the latter kindly allows him to quote) as follows:

" *Libido* cannot be forced into a given channel by an effort of the conscious will. Sublimation, in essence, is an unconscious process, not conscious and deliberate. *Libido* can only be given the requisite opportunities. These, of course, any standard of moral values consciously accepted by the individual helps to provide."

(4) The final aim and object of making a Confession is to obtain Absolution—the pardon of sin by the application of the cleansing Blood of Christ to the soul. The Priest's direction may indeed be of the greatest value; but it is not essential to the integrity of the Sacrament that he should

* In *The Pilgrim* for July, 1921.

† Author of *The New Psychology and its Relation to Life* (Allen and Unwin, 1920).

give any direction at all. What the sinner seeks first and foremost is forgiveness of sin. The "supernatural" element is the centre of the whole process. With all this, of course, the psycho-analyst, as such, has nothing to do. He is concerned, not with sin, but with mental disease; and the possibility of forgiveness—or the need of forgiveness, or the desirability of forgiveness—he does not even take into account.

It will be seen, then, that the *prima facie* resemblances between psycho-analysis and Confession are outweighed—more than outweighed, perhaps, we should say—by their differences. But this does not mean that the clergy have nothing to learn from the new school of psychologists. On the contrary, the study of psycho-analytic principles will be of immense assistance to them, not only in their exercise of the ministry of reconciliation, but in the reasoned presentation of Christianity to their people. We very greatly need, at the present time, a "psychology of Grace," written by some competent scholar who will give full weight, not only to orthodox Catholic doctrine on the subject, but to the assured conclusions of the best modern psychology. I venture, in what follows, to make a tentative suggestion as to one aspect of the problem in which, as it seems to me, we may find a real and legitimate point of contact between psychology and Catholicism.

We have noticed that "sublimation"—the redirection of *libido*, that cosmic force or energy which is the driving power behind all animate life—is an unconscious process. Now, according to Christianity, if man is to achieve God's destiny for him, this *libido* which he shares with the rest of the animal world must in him be reinforced by a special contact between his own personality and that of God, in other words by *grace*. We have, then, something like this:

Libido : Sublimation : : *Grace* : *x*.

Clearly, *x* here is the indwelling Spirit of God. And if the psychologist, as is probable enough, would not accept this "parallel" quite in this form, that would be because (quite rightly, for his special purpose and from his particular point of view) he refuses to "drag in the supernatural," not because the "parallel" contradicts any of his principles. (It may go—he would say it does go, unwarrantably—beyond them: it does not deny them, or question them.) The correspondence is seen to be closer still when we reflect that the presence (indwelling) and work (sanctification) of God the Holy Spirit in the human soul is, normally at least, "unconscious," in the sense of not being recognizable by the immediate evidence of the senses—He dwells in our hearts "by faith"; and, finally, that the "heart" of the writers of the New Testament is in all probability to be equated with the Unconscious of modern psychology.*

CYRIL E. HUDSON.

* *Cf.* K. E. Kirk, *Some Principles of Moral Theology* (Longmans, 1920), p. 145.

REVIEW

THE FAITH OF A QUAKER. By J. W. Graham. Cambridge University Press. Pp. 444. Price 21s. net.

THE author of this impressive volume is the Principal of Dalton Hall in the University of Manchester. While writing, as he tells us, with definite reference to the Society of Friends, he believes that his book will have more than denominational interest. "One cannot touch the foundations of Quakerism without touching the foundations of all religion, our attitude to God, man, and the Universe." Probably not, nor the foundations of any other religion, though the vaunt that Quakerism is "the only considerable adventure in organized Mysticism which has made for itself a permanent place in Christian history during modern times" is a boast very typical of a certain superiority which robs an able book of much of the attractiveness which Quakerism in its old-world dress of dove-coloured silk, as Michael Fairless describes it in *The Grey Brethren*, quiet, peaceable, lowly-hearted, never failed to exert. Mr. Graham seems to attempt for Quakerism something of what St. Thomas Aquinas did for his day, and what the Catholic world now so sorely needs, a *Summa Theologiæ*, a synthesis of modern knowledge in its bearing on religion. Though apparently without the trained mind of a theologian, he has behind him a long life of more general scientific culture. He is, for example, well informed on the results of Biblical criticism, an ardent devotee of psychical research, and a student of psychology and biology. It is probable, however, that many Quakers would read with regret such sentences as these:

"The doctrine of Nicæa (The Trinity) may have been a useful thought-form for the time when it arose; it may have been crystallized experience and speculation in the best shape then possible; but it is not a living part of contemporary thought, and I doubt the usefulness of the washed-out or attenuated forms of the doctrine in which triple manifestations of some kind can be noted or discerned in God. They are really only more polite and less dangerous ways of denying the old conception . . . which has no more authority than a Roman Emperor and a Church Council under his presidency and control can give it. It was no part of the thought of Jesus nor of Paul. The two passages where it occurs are interpolations of the usual doctrinal type. . . . The doctrine represents one of those hard-and-fast lines of division and classification which are never of more than temporary use as scaffolding, and are really in their permanence the bane of theology."

This is a cheap and shallow criticism of a doctrine which has held the mind of Christendom in its articulate form for

seventeen centuries. Further reflection, not to say a more thorough-going belief in the guiding Spirit, and in the Inner Light as the universal possession of Christian men, and more reverence for the experience of friends of God in the past who have lived upon this "bane of theology" for so long, would have deleted or rewritten this and many another passage like it. Indeed, Mr. H. G. Wells, to whom Mr. Graham refers as a teacher with whom he has much in common, though with marked differences in his malignant onslaught on the doctrine of the Trinity, is himself proof how impossible it is for any man honestly to set down his experience of God without at least "an attenuated form" of "triple manifestation." Mr. Wells, with his Creator God, the Veiled Unknown Being; his Finite God, sharing our suffering and struggle; his Immanent Presence, closer than breathing, is the evidence that the Nicene doctrine will never be outgrown while the soul's experience of its God is fundamentally unchanged. Nicæa supplies precisely what alone would make rational the deity of Mr. Wells, the undivided and indivisible unity of God. The consciousness of God, wherever it is articulate, is in essence Trinitarian. Similarly, when speaking of the validity of prayer, our author roundly asserts the uselessness of prayer for victory in war, for success in business, or for fine weather. "No prayer of this kind has ever been of the least avail outside its purely subjective effect upon the devotee or its telepathic message to some other mind." This is surely the extreme of dogmatism. The immanental conception of God is, as we should expect in a Quaker writer, vividly realized and finely expressed. "An indwelling God at the back of the heart of man," so that "we cannot say where God ends and man begins within us." But it is a curious application of that sound doctrine to say of vocal congregational prayer that "in reaching the hearts of the hearers through their ears we reach God within them by setting them individually praying. . . . God is not to be reached by way of the sky."

Mr. Graham in his earlier and doctrinal chapters seeks, by the aid of Dr. Sanday's *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, to interpret the Personality of Christ in the terms of the subliminal.

> "We have come to believe that the greater part of our personality is subconscious, and that we only use for current purposes so many of the resources of the self as have been found terrestrially useful. It is through our subliminal capacities that we have touch with God; they are the source of inspiration and the fountain of genius, the organ of prayer and the scene of the experience of the mystics. Dr. Sanday suggests that in this mysterious and little-known region may lie the secret of the personality of Jesus, that His supraliminal consciousness was human and the product of heredity under terrestrial evolution, but that in the subliminal lay His secret."

M. Bergson appears to us to be more illuminating. Insisting strongly on an intuitive awareness of life as man's greatest endowment, he recognizes that intuition reaches its highest flight when it is able to lift its perceptions within the range, grasp, and criticism of reflective reason. It is not true to say that the subliminal is the organ of prayer. That is to exclude the reason from its noblest function. It would be true to say that it is from a presence in the soul at once beneath and above the reasoning consciousness that the impulse to prayer springs, and to the immediate consciousness of that presence in its higher reaches it attains. But it may well be that we shall find here a solution of many of the problems of the Personality of Christ. In Him intuition was infallible. It was an immediate awareness of eternal life and reality; hence He speaks with the final authority of God wherever He speaks of the eternal. His moral and spiritual verdict is irrefragable. Nor need His incarnate acceptance of the limitation of human ignorance, His " will not to know " in the sphere of the transitory and finite, shake our absolute reliance upon those profound intuitions of eternal life and truth, intuitions which in the great souls of all time have been the pathway of man's spiritual evolution, but which in Him stand unique in their completeness and perfection of perception, for in Him the very Self is the Spirit of God perfectly incarnated, wholly immersed in our humanity, yet not for one instant ceasing to be Himself, God's self. Mr. Graham keeps his footing on the rock when he speaks of the Christ. His Quaker faith stands him in good stead. The Indwelling Christ is for him the same as Christ in the flesh. It is not in vain that the Friends have based their creed on an immanent presence, an inner light, a Christ living and speaking in the soul. Only a Divine Christ could satisfy that demand, and our author positively revels in the storms of criticism and new thought which sweep so many others off their feet. Quakerism is not disturbed when the authority of the Bible seems to be falling, when old interpretations of great articles of the creed are being dismissed as crudities. There are some advantages in days of transition like our own in a faith which, resting on no external supports, fears no earthquakes.

It is the more surprising that the Holy Spirit finds so little mention in Mr. Graham's pages. I recall but one, and that is illuminating. " Such is God in action as distinct from God in essence, . . . what thinkers meant by the Logos and what we generally now describe as the Holy Spirit. It is His communicated life that we have. A religious soul that begins with experience and bases its thought thereon can find in Him a home"

Quakerism has been strong by reason of insistence on the Spirit, and its identification of the Spirit of Jesus with the Spirit of God. Its present service to Christian thought would lie rather in a fresh concentration of its thought upon the Holy Ghost. We could have spared many pages in Mr. Graham's book where he gives rein to the fighting instincts, which Quakerism diverts rather than destroys, in sharp onslaught on other men's religion. Belligerence and superiority are blemishes that spoil an otherwise able and attractive book. Quakers dispense with a professional ministry, with music and musicians, and other aids to worship. They are welcome to do so, but it does not follow that others who use them are of necessity stupid or unspiritual. Our author indulges in a violent onslaught upon Evangelicalism and its "terrible theology," but he does not spare a word for that which was the saving grace of Evangelical theology, its concentration upon the Person of our Lord Jesus, and on the redemptive power of His Cross. It was that Divine central reality, not the wordy arguments by which it was encumbered, that gave to Evangelicalism its power. He indulges, as we should expect, in an attack on sacraments, calling criticism to his aid in an attempt to prove that Christ never intended the Holy Communion to be repeated. It was St. Paul who did the mischief, with no better ground than direct inspiration, "he received it of the Lord"! A strange condemnation this on the lips of a Quaker. We had thought that Quakers still believed in "personal inward revelation." St. Paul, too, was not without inward light. And it is asking too much to ask us to believe, whatever be the solution of the Synoptic account of the Last Supper, that the spiritual instinct of the universal Church, with insignificant exceptions, went hopelessly, blindly wrong, and nourished the souls of martyrs and saints through nineteen centuries on a pure delusion. If it were so, then any faith in a guiding Spirit and an inner light is utterly at an end. The best elements of Quakerism should have saved Mr. Graham from such puerilities. In days like these, when men of goodwill all the world over are drawing nearer to one another, it is more unpardonable to write this kind of controversy. Let us look rather for the truth that lies hid even in one another's errors. Quakerism has proved that it is possible to live the Christian life without sacraments. The Church always said so, given a good conscience even if an ignorant one—*Deus non obligatur sacramentis suis*—but it has not proved that it is better to do so. It has, in effect, shown that the attempt to do without sacraments is unsuitable to the general religious experience. Quakerism is fitted, perhaps, for high-minded exceptions whose numerical smallness supplies

in itself a fresh spiritual stimulus and subtle charm, but it remains out of the broad stream of human need to which the sacramental appeal is generally necessary. To compare sacraments to stimulants which lose their strength through familiarity is to talk without knowledge. Has it proved so? Have sacramental Churches died out? The Quaker Grellet was nearer the mark when he sought to lift every meal to the level of a sacrament. Familiarity with God and the things of God is the method of the Incarnation, and he would be a bold man who would say that in Catholic countries, where worship revolves round the Mass, and the crucifix meets the eye in every lane and street, God was the less remembered.

There is a somewhat purple passage in which Mr. Graham sits apart in a stall in Westminster Abbey contemplating the asceticism of Quaker ways.

> "The glorious music of the white-robed choir is sounding beyond the radiant windows, glowing with the afternoon sun, up to the dim roof above. All is ancient and honourable, and at peace. To be sure, the words of the service do not matter—are indeed hardly audible, and difficult for a Quaker listener to follow. He has come for a rest from very practical duties outside with which the intoned ceremony appears to have little to do. It belongs to another order of things from the moral issues being fought out in the white light of day in the Houses of Parliament and the stately offices round about where the government of the Empire is being carried on with all its freight of good and evil. There would seem not to be any moral value in the service, but there is an undoubted æsthetic value deeply felt, with its blessing of harmony and rest, by the tired stranger in the stall. He thinks more of those plain meeting-houses where he and his fellows, in much poverty of the outward, are trying to achieve the kingdom of God on earth."

We are sorry to think that our author saw no more in our worship than this. But the statues and monuments of the great men of the past who have made England what it is must, however æsthetically deplorable, have caught his eyes wherever they turned. They might have suggested to him, had his mind been less closed by the narrowness of a denominational judgment, that whatever be the defects of Anglicanism as enshrined in the Abbey, at least divorce from the national life was not one of them. But, indeed, the reflection, "God, I thank Thee that I am not as other men are," seldom widens the vision or enlarges the sympathies.

There is plenty of food for thought in Mr. Graham's pages, more that helps than hinders, more that refreshes than annoys. The reviewer not the less regrets the element of controversy which perforce absorbs the space he would more willingly have given to those qualities of the book for which he feels both gratitude and appreciation.

CYRIL HEPHER.

NOTICES

RECENT NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. By Ernest De Witt Burton. International Critical Commentary Series. Pp. i-lxxxix, 1-539. T. and T. Clark. 35s. net.

We have here the work of a sound scholar and a careful thinker, and as he has taken more than twenty years in the preparation of this Commentary it is free from all hasty judgment.

In the Introduction the two questions of the locality of the Churches of Galatia and the date of the Epistle addressed to them are dealt with at length, and the writer shows himself to be well acquainted with the literature on the subject. He adopts what is commonly called the South Galatian theory—namely, that the Churches of Galatia here addressed were those founded by St. Paul, on his first missionary journey, in the southern part of the Roman Province of Galatia. With this the present writer finds himself in agreement, for he adheres to the arguments in favour of it which he published more than twenty years ago. To these he has nothing to add, and he sees no reason to withdraw anything that he then said. And as regards the date of the Epistle, he still thinks that it was written shortly before St. Paul went up to Jerusalem after his third missionary journey, taking with him representatives of the various Gentile Churches to present the great offering which these Churches were making for the benefit of the poor Christians in Jerusalem.

The two principal arguments in favour of this dating of the Epistle are—(1) its doctrinal relation to the Epistle to the Romans, as to the dating of which there is no question; (2) the use of the expression "all the brethren that are with me" in the opening salutation of the Epistle.

The most natural explanation of this phrase is that it refers to the Apostle's travelling companions, and the word πάντες implies that these were many. It was just at this time, when St. Paul was about to take the offering of the Gentile Christians to Jerusalem, that he had many accompanying him, and there is no other time of which this could be said.

Professor Burton gives four possibilities for the dating of the Epistle. It was written, he thinks, either from Corinth on the Apostle's second missionary journey, or at Antioch between the second and third journeys, or at Ephesus on the third journey, or still later on this journey, in Macedonia or Achaia, and he considers that the balance of probability is in favour of Ephesus. But from this last I dissent.

It is certainly a strained interpretation to make the words "all the brethren that are with me" refer, as some have referred them, to the members of a particular Church with whom St. Paul was staying at the time of writing. Professor Burton does not make this mistake, for in his Commentary on i. 2 he says that the phrase designates, not the Christians of the place from which it was written, but the Apostle's fellow-missionaries. We demur, however, to this term "fellow-missionaries," and substitute for it "travelling companions." There is no evidence that St. Paul ever had with him fellow-missionaries so many in number

that he would use the word "all" in reference to them. But we do know that there was one time, and so far as we know only one time, when he had with him a goodly company of travelling companions. This, we argue, was the time when the Epistle to the Galatians was written.

Further, we agree with Lightfoot that the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians are doctrinally akin, and that the Epistle to the Galatians is the earlier of the two. We know that the Epistle to the Romans was written from Corinth just before the Apostle started on his journey to Jerusalem after his third missionary journey (see Rom. xv. 25, 26). The Epistle to the Galatians, then, must be put a little earlier than this, but not too much earlier, as would be the case if it were to be supposed to have been written at Ephesus, for then the Apostle would not have had his many companions about him.

We have already said that we interpret the phrase *οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί* as referring to the Apostle's travelling companions. We may remark in passing that this is confirmed by the phrase of ii. 3, *ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοί, Ἕλλην ὤν, κ.τ.λ.* Here Titus is referred to as St. Paul's companion at the time when he went up to Jerusalem to confer with the other Apostles. He was not only the Apostle's companion, but his deliberately chosen *Gentile* companion, respecting whose non-circumcision St. Paul stood out firmly, however differently he acted in the case of Timothy. It has always seemed to me the strangest of hypotheses that Titus was in fact circumcised, and that what ii. 3 states is only that his circumcision was not of compulsion. Professor Burton has understood this passage rightly, and his treatment of it is thorough and to the point.

We have passed from matters introductory to the subject-matter of the Epistle itself, and here it may be said that the notes throughout the Commentary are uniformly good, and with most of Professor Burton's notes we are in agreement. There is, however, one passage in regard to which we differ from him, and about this we must write at some length. We refer to the passage concerning the two covenants in chapter iv.

Professor Burton inclines to the view, first suggested by Bentley, though he afterwards changed his mind, that the first sentence of verse 25 is no part of the original text, and that its origin is the marginal note of some scribe.

Of the four readings of these words there are only two that need be seriously considered—viz., (*a*) *τὸ δὲ Ἄγαρ Σινὰ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ*, and (*b*) *τὸ γὰρ Σινὰ ὄρος ἐστὶν* [*ὄν*] *ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ*. These two readings (ignoring the participle *ὄν*, of which something will be said presently) only differ by three letters. The reading *a* has *δε* A more than *b*. The former of these stands in the Westcott and Hort text, but the note in their supplementary volume reveals the fact that Westcott was in favour of *b*, while Hort advocates *a*. Westcott is in agreement with Lightfoot, who takes the sentence as a parenthesis—"For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia," or perhaps, "For mount Sinai is in Arabia."

We would point out that in the LXX "mount Sinai" is always *ὄρος Σινά*, never *Σινὰ ὄρος*, and as in the passage before us we have *ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινά* in the preceding verse, it is highly improbable that immediately afterwards the writer (we are supposing the word not to be an interpolation) would have changed the order of the words if he had meant to indicate the same thing. It would seem, then, that if the reading *b* is adopted, the words must be taken to mean "For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia."

The reading *b* is attested by the Codex Sinaiticus, though we must be careful to note that we have in it the participle ὄν standing before the words ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ. Professor Burton argues that the presence of the participle vitiates the evidence of ℵ in favour of *b*. He says: "Since without Ἄγαρ there would be no occasion to insert ὄν, the probability is that Ἄγαρ has fallen out, and that the testimony of ℵ is really in favour of the presence of Ἄγαρ in the text."

But from this criticism I dissent. I should agree with it if we had had ὄρος Σινᾶ instead of Σινὰ ὄρος. But it has already been argued above that Σινὰ ὄρος does not mean "mount Sinai," and that ὄρος must be taken as belonging to the predicate = "For Sinai is a mountain," etc.

This being so, the participle presents no difficulty, for if we allow it to stand, the sentence will mean: "For Sinai is a mountain, situated in Arabia." The presence of the participle only makes more evident the double character of the predicate. Sinai is a mountain, and it is in Arabia. On this use of the participle we may refer Professor Burton to his own note on ii. 3 on pp. 75, 76.

So far, then, from the Codex Sinaiticus being evidence for the reading *a*, it is decidedly in its own favour, and indeed the ὄν may well be part of the original text, for its presence makes the sentence less parenthetical than it would otherwise be: "For these are two covenants; the one from mount Sinai, bearing children unto bondage, which is Hagar [*or* such as is Hagar]. For Sinai is a mountain, and is situated in Arabia, and συνστοιχεῖ with the Jerusalem which now is: for she is in bondage with her children."

I have deliberately left συνστοιχεῖ untranslated, and the reader is referred to the notes in the Commentary as to its meaning.

Now when we come to the reading *a* we are confronted with two serious difficulties: (1) the neuter τό with Ἄγαρ, and (2) Σινὰ ὄρος, instead of ὄρος Σινά, as meaning "mount Sinai."

Commentators seek to explain the neuter τό, but their explanations are not satisfying. Professor Burton himself, reasoning for the moment as if *a* were the original reading, says (and his sentences here read heavily): "It is not the woman Hagar (ἡ Ἄγαρ) of whom the statement is made, either as an historical person or as a character in the narrative to which he is giving an allegorical interpretation, but either the word, in which case ἐστιν affirms the equivalence of the two expressions Ἄγαρ and Σινὰ ὄρος, or by association of ὄρος after Σινᾶ with both Ἄγαρ and Σινά, the mountain." That is to say, that we are to understand τό Ἄγαρ as either (1) the *word* Hagar, or (2) the *mountain* Hagar. It is to put it mildly to say that this is very unsatisfying.

Our argument, then, is that *b*, with or without ὄν, is the true reading; and our justification for devoting so much space to this point must be Professor Burton's contention that the presence of ὄν in ℵ vitiates its evidence in favour of *b*. We hold the exact opposite.

Though so much has been said on the points about which we disagree with Professor Burton, this does not mean that there are not countless things as to which we agree with him. We heartily commend his Commentary to the student who has time for it, though we think it would have been better if it had been more condensed. There is too much of it, and some parts of the notes in the Appendix (pp. 363-521) seem hardly relevant. They exhibit good and careful lexicographical work, and may be useful to a student if they induce him to do the like kind of work for

himself. The diagram on p. 449 does not seem to us particularly helpful, and the whole note on *νόμος* is too long.

It is a pity that this Commentary could not be published cheaper. We know, of course, that the cost of printing has increased enormously, but we fear that the price of the present volume will stand in the way of its circulation.

E. H. Askwith.

The Religious Experience of St. Paul. By Percy Gardner, Litt.D., F.B.A. Williams and Norgate, London. 2nd impression. 1913. Pp. 263.

The Life and Letters of St. Paul. By Rev. Professor David Smith, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton, London. 1919. Pp. xii+704. 21s.

St. Paul: His Life, Letters, and Christian Doctrine. By A. H. McNeile, D.D. Cambridge. 1920. Pp. 319.

Of the three books before us, that of Dr. Gardner has already won for itself an assured place. With the possible exception of Dr. Morgan's recent work on *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, it offers the clearest and most satisfying account of the Apostle's teaching which is yet available in our language. It has a literary charm which is rarely found in theological works, and is distinguished not only by the boldness and sincerity, but by the religious quality of its thinking. Unlike many recent writers who are content to resolve Paulinism into the "influences" which went to form it, Dr. Gardner is alive to its individual character. He makes full allowance for all that was borrowed from Jewish and Hellenistic sources, but the thing that interests him is the contribution of Paul himself. One welcome feature in the book is its indifference to those Pauline terms and formulæ which have misled so many writers into explaining the whole theology on scholastic lines. Dr. Gardner makes us realize that the doctrinal forms are only a scaffolding. He is not afraid to declare that St. Paul is weakest in those argumentative chapters of Romans which were once supposed to convey the inner secret of the faith. His object is always to get down to the vital principles which underlay the Apostle's thinking, and which had their springs in the spiritual experience of the man. This method is undoubtedly the true one, but Dr. Gardner is disposed at times to push it too far. By running back everything to the factor of "experience" he evades not a few difficulties, and discovers an inner unity in Pauline doctrine which is not always apparent. He leaves too much of an impression that St. Paul was essentially a modern thinker, condemned by an historical accident to express himself in antique terms. It is argued, for instance, in the closing chapter that the Apostle's attitude to the supernatural element in the Gospel story was much the same as that which we have now arrived at by the path of historical criticism. "The modern way of regarding the Gospels has brought us back much nearer to the Pauline point of view." A statement of this kind surely requires a good deal of qualification. It would not be difficult to make out that St. Paul, with all his instinct for what was central in the Christian message, was yet bound to mythological conceptions, perhaps more closely than the writers of our Gospels.

Dr. Smith is attracted not so much by Paul the theologian as by Paul the man. He sets himself to develop the notices in the Book of

Acts into a full biography, and translates and expounds the letters in their chronological sequence with a view to illustrating the life and character of the writer. The book is addressed to the general reader rather than to the New Testament expert. It aims at making the career of St. Paul vivid and intelligible to the modern man, and at bringing the greatness of his personality into clear relief. Dr. Smith is equipped for his task with an admirable scholarship, and his wide reading in classical and early Christian literature is at the service of a fine historical imagination. He succeeds in no small degree in his endeavour to transport his readers into the world of St. Paul. The strength of the book lies in this keen realization of the outward conditions of the Apostle's life. Dr. Smith makes little attempt to investigate the Pauline doctrines. He accepts the history as recorded in Acts without any searching discussion of problems. It appears to be his deliberate aim to keep his narrative free from contentious matter that might distract his readers in their contemplation of his hero. This method may be justified on literary and æsthetic grounds, but otherwise its wisdom may be doubted. That Dr. Smith is fully competent to deal with critical questions is manifest from his footnotes, which are often so excellent that their substance might well have been embodied in his text. Perhaps even the general reader would find an added fascination in the life of St. Paul if he were made more fully aware of the many obscurities through which the historian has to grope his way.

Dr. McNeile is chiefly interested in those difficulties which Dr. Smith prefers to leave on one side. To the student his book is of peculiar value as an introduction—the most succinct and complete that we yet possess—to the modern enquiry into the life and writings of St. Paul. Its value is all the greater, as his aim is not so much to advance novel theories as to summarize the results already attained, and to hold the balance between conflicting judgments. The concluding section on the Pauline theology is somewhat meagre and perfunctory, and is not fully abreast of the latest discussions. But in his examination of the history, and perhaps still more of the Epistles, Dr. McNeile has done solid and admirable work. It may be of interest simply to note his conclusions on some of the debated questions. He believes that the visit to Jerusalem in Gal. ii. is identical with that of Acts ii. He regards the Apostolic Decrees as genuine, and holds that they must be understood in a moral rather than a ritual sense. He thinks of the mysterious converts at Ephesus (Acts xviii.), not as disciples of John the Baptist, but as Christians who had not yet advanced on John's conception of baptism. After a very careful analysis he rejects the now dominant theory that the last four chapters of 2 Cor. belong to a separate letter. He accounts for the confusion in the text of Romans by a simple but ingenious conjecture as to the misplacement of the closing doxology, which was probably by a later hand. He rejects the authenticity of the Pastoral Epistles, leaves that of Ephesians an open question, and argues that Philippians was written from Ephesus, the last two chapters being added from a different letter. Such judgments, whether we agree with them or not, are a sufficient guarantee that Dr. McNeile has faced the critical difficulties, and is not afraid to break with received opinion. His general attitude, however, is cautious, and in his distrust of mere clever hypotheses and his anxiety to do justice to both sides of every question, he is faithful to the best traditions of English scholarship.

In their different ways the books before us mark the progress which

has been made in Pauline investigation within recent years. It is now possible to view the Apostle's life in its historical context, and to apply critical tests to the data afforded by the New Testament records. But it must be confessed that the results of the modern enquiry have been chiefly negative. We have now become aware that our knowledge of the history is practically confined to one comparatively short period, and that even this is known to us only in a few episodes, and is beset with many perplexities. St. Paul has left so strong an impression of his personality that we often fail to realize how little is actually told us of his life. It is much the same with his religious teaching. No one doubted a generation ago that the Pauline theology could be fully reconstructed from the Epistles, and set forth in systematic fashion. But we have now grown much more diffident. It is questionable whether St. Paul ever worked out his theology as a logical whole, and whether his extant writings afford us anything like an adequate outline of his thought. It becomes ever harder to determine his true relation to Jesus, to the primitive Church, to Judaism, to Hellenistic religion and philosophy. At no point in the investigation can we proceed very far without encountering grave problems, and it is not likely that any of them will be completely solved. But the labour spent on them is making us ever more certain of the surpassing greatness of the Apostle's character and achievement, and of the permanent religious value of his message. This is the one positive result of the modern enquiry, and is itself sufficient to justify it.

E. F. Scott.

BOOK NOTES

It is a real pleasure to some people to read sermons, and such (would they were more!) will welcome Fr. McCabe's book. In his Preface the Roman Catholic Bishop of Northampton urges his clergy to take a reasonable "professional ambition" in the matter of sermon-making and sermon-preaching. Men and women who neglect the written word still flock to hear the spoken word: how often do they turn away unrefreshed! Many an Anglican preacher could learn from *Matters of Moment* (Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, 6s. net.) much that would help him to overcome the bugbear of the pulpit. Here is simplicity wedded to depth: insight walking hand in hand with clearness of expression. No less than fifty short sermons are contained in this delightful little volume.

The Vicar of All Hallows, Hoo, Kent (the Rev. F. J. Hammond), deals in an arresting and vivid manner with one of the greatest ecclesiastical problems of to-day. Not only is it an ecclesiastical problem, but, as Mr. Hammond points out in *The Starvelings* (Soc. of SS. Peter and Paul, 3s. 6d. net), it is rapidly becoming a spiritual one too. The Lady Poverty is like to become "a slattern," when penury takes the place of decent poverty. One of the most pathetic stories of to-day is that which is told by hundreds of vicarages and rectories in the Church of England. It has another side too—a side of bravery and courage which marks out the poor parson and his wife for the homage of all right-minded men. Mr. Hammond and Mr. Maurice Hewlett (who contributes an Introduction to this pamphlet) both feel the paramount importance of "holy simplicity," and both demand for the clergy the right to live such a life. Though much has already been said and written on the subject of clerical poverty, this little pamphlet merits the close attention of Churchpeople.

The three following books belong to what was called, till lately, the

literature of reconstruction, though the word itself has been suddenly dropped. Reconstruction if it means anything implies the toilsome laying of one brick upon another; unfortunately, these writers, like some of their predecessors, are more concerned with "throwing bricks." But each book contains something of interest and value for those who can read with discrimination.

The Spirit of Jesus and the Churches, by Joshua Holden (Methuen, 3s. 6d.), is a carefully written book by the headmaster of Woking County Secondary School. The standpoint is not ours, but the main thesis, that the simplicity of the Gospel is overlaid in all churches alike by an elaborate superstructure of institutionalism largely inherited from the past, contains a warning that is never unnecessary.

Mr. Ralfe Davies's *Anglo-Catholics and the Future* (Society of SS. Peter and Paul, 5s.) has a domestic interest for Anglicans if it in any way represents the views of a section of their Communion. The author deplores the Enabling Act as a tragedy, and advocates the establishment of a General Staff, from which bishops must be excluded, to prepare for the exodus of Anglo-Catholics from the Established Church. Endowments are to be sacrificed, and priests to earn their living by some other trade or profession. All ancient cathedrals and churches are to be relinquished to the National Protestant Church (Catholicism is apparently to be confined to large towns). The "present banality" of Evensong is to cease, Rosary and Benediction to become universal in Anglo-Catholic churches, and the mere "churchgoer" to be bidden to take himself elsewhere. Politically the writer is a Socialist of a type now nearly extinct; to collect rent from a working man is in his view tantamount to stealing a pair of children's boots from his house each week. An intentionally provocative book inspired by a longing for reality and a hatred of compromises.

The great religious communities of our country are in a chastened and penitent mood; they feel deeply their failure to represent Christ to the world. But the small community of Friends with its great wealth and widespread propaganda is in a different mood, if Dr. Vipont Brown's *Quaker Aspects of Truth* (Swarthmore Press, 5s.) is any criterion. Optimism pervades the book. There is no original sin—"such depravity as there is . . . is due, not to human nature, but to human institutions," such as capitalism. Traditional Christianity is all wrong, the Nicene Creed is "a degenerate product of Greek philosophy." "When everything has been eliminated from Christianity which is not of Christ, then what is left is Quakerism." The Evangelical Churches of to-day best represent the Pharisees of our Lord's time. The world would have been a better place had there been no churches or chapels. These are not the rantings of a Hyde Park orator, but the convictions of a devout and well-read medical man, whose book is put out by the Friends' publishing house.

The Origin and Growth of the English Parish, illustrated by material taken from the *Exeter Episcopal Registers* (S.S.P.P., 1s. 6d.), by O. J. Reichel, is a learned pamphlet by a well-known authority on Canon Law.

My Rosary, by R. Keable (S.S.P.P., 2s.), is designed for children, and hardly comes within the scope of this periodical. But it is a fair question to ask the Society responsible for its publication whether, if they put out for children a book which teaches that "God prefers to talk to us through her [Mary]," they will not publish a treatise by some well-known theologian justifying such a thesis.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER